SEMINARIES AND SEMINARIANS:

A STUDY OF THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF PROTESTANT CLERGYMEN

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
Princeton Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

---

by
Jackson Walker Carroll
June 1970

SEMINARIES AND SEMINARIANS:
A STUDY OF THE PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION OF PROTESTANT CLERGYMEN

Abstract of a Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of
Princeton Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Theology

by
Jackson Walker Carroll
June 1970

In the process of professional socialization, the minister acquires his professional self, with its characteristic attitudes, values, knowledge and skills. Although this process is broader than the period of formal professional education in a theological seminary, it is during this period that socialization into ministry receives its most explicit focus. This dissertation concentrates attention on the period of formal theological education to explore several hypotheses predicting that differences in models of theological education account partially for differences in aspects of the minister's professional self. Three models of theological seminaries are identified through a historical analysis of the goals of theological education and of ways in which seminaries have been organized to give expression to these goals. The goals identified include mastery of the Christian tradition, practical competence, spiritual formation, and secular awareness. The three seminary models are the Religious Community, the Vocational School, and the Graduate School.

Following discussion of theoretical and historical matters, the results of an empirical study to test the hypotheses mentioned above are reported. Data for the study are drawn from the responses of 1,584 ministers to two questionnaires. The first was mailed in 1965 to a national sample of Protestant ministers from six denominations in connection with the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries. The second was mailed in 1968 to a selected sub-sample of ministers--representing twenty-one seminaries--to gather additional information

regarding their seminary experience. A structural effects design is used to convert responses of individuals into structural variables and to test the major hypotheses. The respondents' rankings of the goals of theological education are combined into a measure of individual philosophies of theological education. This measure is then used to construct a measure of the social climate or model of each of the seminaries. Three models emerge empirically, and they are taken to approximate the historical models mentioned above.

Two chapters are devoted to exploring a number of empirical correlates of the philosophies and models of theological education. Several differences are found among the four philosophy types in pre-seminary characteristics, in seminary activities, and in subsequent ministerial careers. Likewise, interesting differences are found among the three models of theological schools in their graduates' aggregate characteristics, in aspects of the schools reported by the respondents, and in measures derived from catalogues and similar sources.

Next, three chapters consider the principal hypotheses regarding the effects of models of theological education on the development of the professional self, which is conceptualized and measured in terms of theological orientation, social-ethical perspective, and image of ministry. As hypothesized, Religious Community graduates are found to be theologically conservative, principles oriented ethically, and expressive in image of ministry. Conversely, Graduate School men tend to be theologically liberal, contextual ethically, and instrumental in image of ministry. Vocational School graduates, as expected, occupy a middle position between graduates of the other two types. Other independent variables are found generally to interpret but not to render spurious these relationships. Additionally, several other attitudinal measures are examined in relation to the primary measures. These include theological certainty (which is negatively correlated with theological liberalism), several measures concerning social issues, measures concerning enjoyment of specific ministerial roles, and a measure of ministerial morale. High morale is found to be positively correlated with more conservative theological orientations, principles ethics, and an expressive image of ministry.

In the final chapter, the implications of these findings are considered for professional socialization and for theological education. The features of a possible fourth model of theological education are suggested, in which the meaning defining role of ministers in the context of contemporary society is given primary emphasis.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To express appreciation to all who have, in one way or another, contributed to this study would, on the one hand, require a longer list than space allows and, on the other hand, necessitate more adequate means of expression than words allow. Therefore, in either case, the acknowledgments below are considerably inadequate.

My interest in this study was whetted by the fortuitous coalescence of graduate study under the direction of Dr. Samuel W. Blizzard, whose ground-breaking research concerning ministers is well known, and participation in Dr. Wilbert E. Moore's seminar in the Sociology of Work and the Professions at Princeton University. To both of these men I owe a considerable intellectual debt, and I am deeply grateful for their counsel, encouragement and friendship.

A special word of appreciation is due to Dr. Blizzard, who has directed my work on this thesis. Not only has his wealth of insight into the subject matter of the thesis been an invaluable resource, but equally as important has been his personal friendship and support.

The other members of my thesis committee are also due considerable appreciation. Dr. M. Richard Shaull has helped me to gain insight into a number of the theological issues considered in the thesis and to conceptualize them for empirical study. I am also deeply grateful for the methodological and substantive assistance given me by Dr. Robert P. Althauser of Princeton University. His patience and counsel in helping me to design the research and to gain clarity on a number of technical and substantive matters are deeply appreciated. I am also grateful to Dr. Dean Hoge for his reading and critical comments on the thesis.

Another person who has made a very important contribution to the study is Dr. Jeffrey Hadden of Tulane University. I am grateful for his generosity in making available for secondary analysis the data from the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries. Also, Dr. Charles Westoff, formerly chairman of the Department of Sociology of Princeton University, very graciously made available to me computer time at the Princeton University Computer Center for the analysis of the data.

It is also obvious that considerable gratitude is due to the many ministers who completed the two questionnaires used in the study. Their candor about themselves and their willingness to cooperate in the research have made the study possible.

While the research was not directly supported by a grant, my graduate study, and thus indirectly the research, was made possible by Danforth Campus Ministry Awards for two years and by a Rockefeller Doctoral Fellowship in Theology for one year. Therefore, I wish to acknowledge my gratitude to these foundations.

My considerable appreciation is also due to those whose technical assistance has made the thesis possible. Mrs. Elizabeth Morgan has borne, without audible complaint, the brunt of typing and retyping of the first draft of the manuscript and revisions. Miss Marie Townsend, of the Religious Research Center of Emory University, has rendered very helpful statistical assistance, and Mrs. Shirley Brown has enabled the final typescript to be completed on time.

Finally, a special word of gratitude must be paid to the three persons who, in addition to myself, have most closely shared the agonies and joys of this research--my wife, Anne, and my daughters, Susan and Fran. Not only were they understanding, supportive, and long-suffering during the years of graduate study, but they also had an active part in this research project. Susan and Fran became quite adept in folding questionnaires, and in stuffing and stamping envelopes in order that the follow-up questionnaire might be mailed on schedule. The study would not have been possible without the assistance which my wife, Anne, rendered in mailing, coding, typing, editing, and many of the other sometimes onerous aspects of the process. Therefore, it is to these three--Anne, Susan, and Fran--that this study is lovingly and gratefully dedicated.

A—

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii
LIST OF TABLES ix
LIST OF FIGURES xv

CHAPTER

I. SEMINARIES AND SEMINARIANS: AN INTRODUCTORY OVERVIEW 1
II. PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION: ISSUES AND AGENTS 17
  Socialization and Professional Socialization 17
  Agencies of Socialization 31
III. THE GOALS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION 47
  The Goals of Theological Education--A Historical Overview . 49
    Mastery of the Christian Tradition 52
    Spiritual Formation 59
    Practical Competence 67
    Secular Awareness 74
  Models of Theological Education 81
IV. RESEARCH PROCEDURES: DESIGN AND ANALYSIS 91
  The Natural History of the Research 92
  Methods of Data Collection 96
  The Measurement of Social Climates--A Structural Effects Design 100
V. PHILOSOPHIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION: SOME SOCIAL CORRELATES 114

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER PAGE

Pre-Seminary Correlates 117

Philosophy of Theological Education and Seminary Experience 137

Philosophy of Theological Education and Ministerial Careers 148

VI. SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPES OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS . . 160

Aggregate Characteristics of Graduates of Each Seminary Type 161

Graduates' Reports Concerning Seminary Characteristics . . 169

Other Characteristics of the Seminary Types 178

VII. SOCIAL CLIMATE AND THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION 201

Theological Orientations: Meaning and Measurement. 203

Seminary Effects of Theological Orientations 212

Theological Certainty 234

VIII. SOCIAL CLIMATE AND SOCIAL-ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES 244

Ethics and Ministry 244

Measures of Social-Ethical Perspectives 250

Seminaries and Ethical Orientations 257

Other Measures of Social-Ethical Perspectives 274

IX. SOCIAL CLIMATE AND IMAGE OF MINISTRY 292

The Importance of Images of Ministry 294

Expressive and Instrumental Images 301

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

CHAPTER PAGE

Seminaries and Images of Ministry 314
The Consistency of the "Professional Self". 329
X. CONCLUSION: SOME IMPLICATIONS AND SPECULATION 345
Major Findings 346
Methodological and Theoretical Implications 351
Implications for Theological Education 358
BIBLIOGRAPHY 382
APPENDICES 400
APPENDIX A. QUESTIONNAIRES 401
APPENDIX B. SAMPLING CONSIDERATIONS 410
APPENDIX C. SCALES AND INDICES USED 420
APPENDIX D. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES 439

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1. Distributions (by Percentages) for the Rankings Given to the Four Goals of Theological Education. 107
2. Ranking of Goals of Theological Education (Percentage) by Seminaries and Year of Graduation 109
3. Father's Occupation by Philosophy of Theological Education .119
4. Comparisons of Means of the Scores for Father's Socioeconomic Status for the Four Groups Holding Differing Philosophies of Theological Education 120
5. Denomination by Philosophy of Theological Education. 123
6. Self-Ascribed Religious Commitment During High School by Philosophy of Theological Education 124
7. Father's Religious Participation by Philosophy of Theological Education 125
8. Decision to Enter Ministry by Philosophy of Theological Education 127
9. Age for Normal and Late Groups at the Time When the Ministry was First Considered by Philosophy of Theological Education 129
10. Significant Person at the Time of Decision to Enter Ministry by Philosophy of Theological Education. 131
11. College Major by Philosophy of Theological Education 134

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE PAGE

12. Grades in College (Average) by Philosophy of Theological Education 135

13. Major Reason for Choosing Seminary by Philosophy of Theological Education .139

14. Major Field of Interest During Seminary by Philosophy of Theological Education 143

15. Average Grade During Seminary by Philosophy of Theological Education 145

16. Regular Participation in Selected Activities During Seminary by Philosophy of Theological Education 146

17. Type of Ministry at Different Time Periods by Philosophy of Theological Education. 151

18. Combined Parish and Associate Minister Categories of Table 17 by Type of Philosophy of Theological Education .154

19. Percent in the Three Seminary Types from Varying Socio-economic Backgrounds (Father's Socio-economic Status) . .162

20. Type of Undergraduate School Attended by Seminary Type . .165

21. Percent Within Each Seminary Type Engaging in Various Kinds of Activities 168

22. Student's Perception of Faculty's Attidude Toward the Institutional Church by Seminary Type 171

23. Use of Seminars in Teaching by Type of Seminary 173

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE PAGE

24. Helpfulness of Seminary for Various Aspects of the Minister's Role and Understanding by Seminary Type . . . 175

25. Curriculum Offerings in Various Areas by Type of Seminary . 179

26. Index of Institutional Quality by Seminary Type 183

27. Variables Used to Construct Quality Index by Seminary Type. 184

28. Percentages of Seminaries Having On or Off Campus Housing as the Modal Housing for their Graduates by Type of Seminary 190

29. Relationship to Other Educational Institutions by Seminary Type 194

30. Degree of Helpfulness of Seminary Education by Seminary Type and Institutional Relation 196

31. Theological Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy. 214

32. Index of Dissimilarity for Measures of Theological Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy. . . 216

33. Percent Liberal on Theological Orientation by Seminary Type and Selected Variables 220

34. Product-Moment Correlations Between Liberal Theological Orientations and a Low Degree of Certainty Regarding Basic Beliefs, Within Each Type of Seminary 235

35. Ethical Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy 259

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE PAGE

36. Percent Expressing Contextualist Ethical Orientation by Seminary Type and Selected Variables 263

37. Attitude Toward Church's Involvement in Society by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy 277

38. Percentage Distribution for the Scale Types on the Scale Measuring Attitudes Toward Church Involvement in Social Issues. 279

39. Attitude Towards Civil Rights by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy 282

40. Product-Moment Intercorrelations Between Various Social-Ethical and Theology Scales. 284

41. Product-Moment Correlations Between Image of Ministry and Practitioner Roles 313

42. Image of Ministry by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy . 315

43. Index of Dissimilarity of Image of Ministry by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy 316

44. Percent Instrumental on Images of Ministry by Seminary Type and Selected Variables 321

45. Product-Moment Correlations Between Theological Orientations, Social-Ethical Perspectives and Images of Ministry 331

46. Product-Moment Correlations Between Ministerial Morale

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE PAGE

and Enjoyment of Various Ministerial Roles 334

47. Comparison of Seminary Cohorts in the Danforth Study, the Total Sample Drawn for the Follow-up Seminary Survey and the Number Responding to the Seminary Survey. . 413

48. Comparisons of Respondents to the Danforth Survey with Respondents to the Follow-up Seminary Survey by Denomination on Selected Belief Statements 415

49. Comparisons of Respondents to the Danforth Survey with Respondents to the Follow-up Seminary Survey by Age Cohorts and Denomination on Selected Belief Statements . . 417

50. Comparisons Between Respondents to Seminary Survey and the Total Sample to Which the Seminary Survey Was Sent, on Selected Belief Items 418

51. Theological Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy, Controlling for Preference for Seminary. . . . 439

52. Theological Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy, Controlling for Seminary Rank on Quality Index 442

53. Ethical Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy Controlling for Father's Socio-economic Status . . . 445

54. Ethical Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy Controlling for Preference for Seminary. 448

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

TABLE PAGE

55. Ethical Orientation by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy, Controlling for Denomination 450

56. Image of Ministry by Seminary Type and Personal Philosophy, Controlling for Preference for Seminary. 455

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE PAGE

I. Types of Theological Schools. 12

II. Dummy Structural Effects Table. 105

CHAPTER I

SEMINARIES AND SEMINARIANS: AN INTRODUCTORY OVERVIEW

In a memorable verse from his poem, "Epistle to John Lapraik," Robert Burns clearly discerns that there exist in society organizations whose major purpose is that of producing change in the persons who pass through them for a limited time. Concerning the university education of young gentlemen in his day, Burns observed:

> A set o' dull conceited hashes (fellows)
> Confuse their brains in college classes!
> They gang in stirks (bulls) and come out asses,
>   Plain truth to speak;
> An' syne (soon) they think to climb Parnassus
>   By dint o' Greek!

Whether one agrees or not with Burns' rather invidious appraisal of the net effects of the changes wrought in their "products" by educational institutions, one is aware, nonetheless, that Burns believed it possible to attribute such effects to the influence of these institutions. It is the purpose of this study to consider the effects of one type of educational institution, the Protestant theological seminary. More specifically, the focus is on the effects of theological seminaries in the process of socialization into the profession of ministry. To be even more specific, there is the concern to account partially for variations in the outcomes of professional socialization by reference to variations in types of theological seminaries. It is a part of the social lore of theological education that the "products" of different seminaries are frequently distinctively different themselves, and often in recognizable ways.[1] To test this generalization and to try to identify some of the organizational aspects of seminaries which affect the socialization process is, therefore, the major concern of the study. It is hoped thereby to contribute both to a clearer understanding of the processes of theological education and to the relatively small but growing body of theory and research regarding socialization into the professions.[2]

In the following chapter, the theoretical assumptions which underlie the research will be considered in some depth. However, in this introductory chapter, the attempt is made to give a brief overview of the theory and design of the research and to state the major hypotheses to be tested. In this way the reader may hopefully have some view of the whole while considering the various parts to come.

A professional, in the technical sense of the word, is a person whose occupation approximates the following criteria: (1) the occupation must be full time; (2) he is the possessor of "esoteric" knowledge (useful according to the values of the society in which he practices) based on specialized training of exceptional duration; (3) he is set apart from the laity by various signs and symbols, but he is identified with his peers, often in formalized organizations; (4) in the use of his specialized knowledge, the professional proceeds by his own discretion, but this autonomy is to be used responsibly; (5) he has a service orientation in which rewards are considered secondary to service to the clients; and (6) he has a sense of calling or commitment to the occupation.[3] These attributes, which are individually variable and which collectively may be regarded as an index of professionalization, are sufficient at this point to indicate the general meaning of profession or professional as the terms are used in this research. I am considering the ministry to be a profession and, therefore, as conforming more or less to the attributes listed above.

---

[1] When I was considering which theological school to attend, I was advised by a denominational official to attend seminary x rather than seminary y. "Graduates of y always have difficulty in fitting into the Methodist system," I was told, "while graduates of x have no problems."

[2] Since this body of research will be referred to and discussed at a number of points below, no attempt will be made either to list or summarize it at this juncture.

If this may suffice at this point as a definition of a professional, then it may be said further that professional socialization is that process through which the professional acquires the attributes mentioned in the definition, especially those which are attitudinal and behavioral in nature. In their study of medical education, Merton, Reeder and Kendall provide a fuller definition of professional socialization:

---

[3] These criteria of professionalization are drawn from Wilbert E. Moore, with Gerald Rosenblum, *The Professions in Modern Society* (unpublished manuscript of a forthcoming book). The problem of defining the attributes of a profession is a hoary one indeed. [See Morris L. Cogan, "Toward a Definition of Profession," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXIII (Winter, 1953), pp. 33-50]. Since this study is concerned neither with comparing professions with non-professions nor with inter-professional comparisons, I do not feel it necessary to engage in a lengthy discussion of what constitutes a profession.

> . . . the technical term socialization designates the process by which people selectively acquire the values and attitudes, the interests, skills, and knowledge--in short, the culture--current in the groups of which they are, or seek to become, a member. It refers to the learning of social roles. In its application to the medical student, socialization refers to the processes through which he develops his professional self, with its characteristic values, attitudes, knowledge and skills, fusing these into a more or less consistent set of dispositions, which govern his behavior in a wide variety of professional (and extraprofessional) situations.[4]

This definition is helpful in that it stresses that socialization into a profession is more than a cognitive process. My intention is not to minimize the cognitive aspects of professional socialization; however, it is important to emphasize what Merton *et al*. refer to as the development of "the professional self," which, I believe, involves considerably more than cognition. That is, agents of professional socialization are generally concerned, not only with the transmission of knowledge, but also with the shaping of values and norms related to the practice of the profession. This is particularly true of socialization into the ministry. As James Gustafson has pointed out, "In the ministry what a man believes and trusts in as the basis of his own personal coherence and integrity is also a part of his public and professional selfhood."[5]

The concept of professional selfhood is obviously too diffuse to allow for precise conceptualization and measurement. Therefore, I have sought to approximate it by considering it as a multi-dimensional concept. With reference to the ministry, I have defined three basic dimensions which will be considered as indicators of the professional selfhood into which the aspiring minister is socialized.

---

[4] *The Student Physician* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 287.

[5] "Theological Education as Professional Education," *Theological Education*, V (Spring, 1969), p. 245.

(1) First, there is the minister's basic theological orientation. While this dimension obviously may refer to what the minister knows cognitively about theology, as a part of his "esoteric" knowledge as a professional, this is not the primary concern here. Rather the concern is, as the quotation from Gustafson (above) indicates, with what the minister believes and trusts in in an ultimate sense. The designations "conservative" and "liberal," while grossly overworked, have been used in this study, for lack of more adequate labels, to indicate the continuum on which theological orientations vary. As a working definition, a high degree of theological conservatism has been defined as involving a positive orientation towards traditional or orthodox, supernatural beliefs, and a rejection of attempts to liberalize or reinterpret traditional doctrines in light of contemporary thought and experience. Conversely, the highly liberal orientation has been defined as reflecting opposite tendencies, that is, a more man-centered, Christianly humanistic position, in which contemporary thought and experience are taken quite seriously in interpreting, reinterpreting, and often rejecting traditional formulations. Several other measures relating to theological orientation were also developed which are used further to interpret the meaning

of the basic liberal-conservative dimension.

(2) A second dimension to be considered is the social-ethical perspective of the ministers. By this is not meant the professional ethics of the minister, in the usual sense of the term, but rather the minister's attitude regarding the moral life and the quality of society. Professions vary in the degree to which such perspectives are "built into" their role expectations. While most professional groups have not eschewed socio-political concerns,[6] it is nevertheless the case that a more or less explicit social-ethical perspective has historically been a part of the minister's role, at least to the extent that the prophetic heritage in the Judaeo-Christian tradition has been taken seriously. Furthermore, given the increasingly visible and controversial contemporary involvement of ministers in socio-political concerns,[7] it seems especially important to consider this dimension. To do so, several measures have been used. The primary measure reflects the contemporary debate between ethics based on rules or principles and situational or contextual ethics.[8] In addition, several measures of attitudes on specific current social issues are also included.

---

[6] See, for example, S. M. Lipset and Mildred A. Swartz, "The Politics of Professionals," Professionalization, eds. Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 299-310.

[7] See Jeffrey K. Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1969), pp. 163-207.

[8] See, for example, James Gustafson, "Context Versus Principles," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (April, 1965), pp. 171-202.

(3) Finally, the minister's image of himself as a minister is considered. This dimension refers not so much to specific ministerial roles, such as preacher, teacher, pastor, priest, etc., but rather to the basic frame of reference by which the minister defines his professional self and orients himself in his various role relationships. I have defined this professional self-image as varying on a continuum between expressive and instrumental self-definitions.[9] The expressive pole of the continuum reflects a diffuse, qualitative self-image. Ministry is first of all a state of being. Conversely, the instrumental pole reflects a "doing" image of the ministry. The ministry is primarily something that one does, functions that one performs to accomplish specific purposes. The minister has specialized knowledge and skills to enable him to perform these tasks as a professional, but it is his special competence rather than any personal qualities which sets him apart from the laity. To supplement and interpret this measure of self-image, several measures relating to enjoyment of specific ministerial roles will be used. Also, a measure of the minister's evaluation of the significance of the ministry as a profession will be considered in relation to the image of the ministry.

These three basic dimensions--theological orientation, social ethical perspective, and image of the ministry--constitute what I am taking to be approximations of the more diffuse concept of "professional self" into which the minister is socialized. No claim is made that they exhaust the meaning of "professional self"; however, they are suggested as important indicators. That these three dimensions are positively correlated, forming a clearly distinguishable, consistent "professional self," seems to be a plausible assumption; however, so many non-measured factors potentially influence this relationship that consistency is difficult to demonstrate empirically. Rather than making this assumption central to the analysis, I have chosen to concentrate on each of these dimensions as a separate dependent variable.

---

[9] See Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961), pp. 142 ff.

Professional socialization into the ministry (or any profession), which includes the development of the "professional self" as I have described it, obviously does not begin or end with the period of formal theological education. As Samuel Blizzard has written, socialization into the ministry began when the future minister "first heard a person called 'Reverend' or recognized a person as minister."[10] Equally important is the socialization that occurs in the ministry and in other professions after graduation from the professional school. It is especially in the years immediately following graduation when the professional experiences the "reality shock" of role assumption.[11] Nevertheless, the particular concern of this study is with the formal period of professional socialization (typically three years) when the aspiring minister is a student in a theological seminary. To the extent that it is possible and necessary to do so, both pre- and post-seminary factors are considered in their influence on professional socialization--for example, parental socio-economic status, age of decision to enter the ministry, and type of current ministry. However, major attention is focused upon factors within the seminary itself.

---

[10] "The Parish Minister's Self-Image of His Master Role," Pastoral Psychology, IX (December, 1958), p. 27.

Among aspects of the seminary organization to be considered as independent variables, the primary one is the differing emphases given by various seminaries to the goals of theological education. It was previously mentioned that, according to the social lore of theological education, graduates of different seminaries are often recognizably different in their understanding of and approach to ministry. The major hypothesis to be tested in this study is that these differences, which can be expressed in terms of the above mentioned dimensions of the professional self, can be partially explained by differential emphasis given to the goals of theological education by various seminaries.

---

[11] See, for example, Dan C. Lortie, "Laymen to Lawmen: Law School, Careers, and Professional Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall, 1959), pp. 363-367. The term, "reality shock" seems first to have been used in this context by Miriam Wagenschein, "Reality Shock" (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Chicago, 1951).

In order to test this hypothesis, it is necessary to classify seminaries according to the ranking of the goals of theological education. The theoretical assumptions, a historical analysis of the development of the goals of theological education, and a more detailed description of the methods for classifying the seminaries into types are considered in later chapters. Suffice it to indicate here that four basic goals of theological education are identified, which may be briefly defined as follows:

(1) Mastery of the Christian Tradition: This goal refers, as the designation suggests, to an emphasis on the mastery of the basic substantive content of the Christian tradition, which provides the distinctive intellectual "equipment" for the exercise of Christian ministry as well as the expression of the minister's ultimate commitment.

(2) Practical Competence: This goal has reference to training in theory and practice relating to the various roles of the ministry. The concern is both with the development of skills, and with the theory, values and norms which underlie and inform the skills.

(3) Spiritual Formation: The designation, derived from the Roman Catholic tradition, expresses the concern of the seminary to develop and deepen the spiritual life and Christian commitment of the seminarian in the context of Christian community.

(4) Secular Awareness: This goal stems from a concern that the church and ministry be aware of, understand, and be involved in the world in a relevant way as an expression of Christian mission.

Logically, there are twenty-four possible ways in which these four goals could be ranked in order of importance by a given seminary. Such an exhaustive classification is neither practical for purposes of research nor, as will be suggested, necessary for historical reasons. A much simpler and more limited solution was followed by assuming that the four goals could be grouped into dichotomous pairs: (1) mastery of the tradition as contrasted with the development of practical competence, and (2) spiritual formation as contrasted with secular awareness. These pairs have some empirical justification in the long-standing contrast made by theological students (and faculty) between the "content" and "practical" courses and between "spiritual" and "worldly" concerns. Normatively, a good case can be made for asserting that they are ultimately false distinctions; nevertheless, their continuing usage in the everyday world of the seminary perhaps gives some empirical, if not normative, justification for using the pairs. When the pairs of goals are cross-tabulated, four types of seminaries (according to goal emphases or what I will later refer to as "social climates") are possible, as Figure 1 illustrates. Actually, however, the data yielded only three of the four possibilities. The combination of major emphasis upon practical competence and secular awareness failed to emerge empirically. Interestingly, some of the literature discussing the history of theological education only treats three models.[12] Although the attempt to link the empirically derived types in this study with the historic models is somewhat arbitrary, I believe that to do so makes some sense and aids in interpreting the findings. For this reason, the three types of seminaries identified are referred to in terms of the historic emphases: (1) The Religious Community model, combining an emphasis on mastery of the Christian tradition with spiritual formation; (2) the Vocational School model, combining practical competence and spiritual formation as dominant emphases; and (3) the Graduate School model, combining mastery of the tradition with the fostering of secular awareness. The historical analysis in Chapter Three should aid considerably in giving some

---

[12] See, for example, F. Thomas Trotter, "The Modern Seminary: A Mixture of Three Models," The Christian Advocate, X (July 14, 1966), pp. 7-8. Also, see Robert Kelly, Theological Education in America (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924), pp. 91-110.

	MASTERY OF TRADITION	PRACTICAL COMPETENCE
SPIRITUAL FORMATION	TYPE A "Religious Community"	TYPE B "Vocational School"
SECULAR AWARENESS	TYPE C "Graduate School"	TYPE D Undesignated

FIGURE 1

TYPES OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

"flesh and blood" to these three types or models of theological seminaries, and also it should help to clarify the logic of the hypotheses relating types of schools to differences in the three major dependent variables or socialization outcomes. These hypotheses need now to be briefly stated:

(1) Differences in theological orientations can be partially explained by differences in the type of school attended. There will be a movement from a conservative to liberal theological orientation as graduates of the Religious Community, the Vocational School, and the Graduate School models, are compared in that order.

(2) Differences in social-ethical perspectives will also vary with the type of school attended, with a progression from a "principles" to a "contextual" approach to ethics as graduates of the three types of schools are compared in the same order as in hypothesis one.

(3) There will be a movement from expressive to instrumental orientations to ministry as graduates of the Religious Community, the Vocational School and the Graduate School models are compared in that order.

These hypotheses are expected to hold regardless of personal preferences for the ranking of the goals of theological education.

Obviously the ranking of the goals of theological education by the various seminaries is not the only factor affecting socialization. Therefore, controls are also introduced for certain other variables. In addition to the background characteristics mentioned previously, other variables controlled for (where logic suggests the necessity to do so) are (1) denomination, (2) preference for the seminary attended, (3) an index of seminary quality, (4) the type of housing lived in during seminary (as an indication of involvement in the seminary ethos), (5) the ranking of seminary goals by one's peers, and (6) the type of ministry engaged in at the present time. The logic for the choice of these several variables can more appropriately be explained as the variables are introduced into the data analysis. It is hypothesized that these variables will interpret, but not render spurious, the relationships predicted in the main hypotheses.

The data used to test these hypotheses are drawn from two mailed questionnaires, an original and a follow-up, which will be described below in Chapter Four. The respondents are Protestant ministers from six major denominations. The ministers are fairly recent graduates of twenty-one Protestant seminaries which are grouped together into the three types mentioned above. A "structural effects" design as suggested especially by Peter Blau[13] is the primary method of analysis used in testing the hypotheses.

In concluding this introductory overview, one further point should be briefly made. While it is my hope that a study such as this will make a contribution to the sociology of occupations and professions, I also hope that the study may prove useful to those concerned with theological education. Anyone at all aware of the discussions taking place today among theological educators knows the considerable ferment that exists. Curriculum revisions, proposal of new models of theological education, and radical criticism of past and current practices are but a part of the ferment. The sense of inadequacy of past and present practices has nowhere been more succinctly put than in the blunt judgment of Charles R. Feilding: "Ministry today is generally discontinuous with the preparation provided for it."[14]

---

[13] See his article, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, XXV (April, 1960), pp. 178-193.

This research can, in last analysis, neither substantiate nor disconfirm Feilding's judgment; although inferences may be drawn from the findings which have a bearing on his statement. Neither does the research per se suggest new models of theological education; nevertheless, again, inferences may be drawn which can contribute to the search for new models. In the final chapter, I will suggest some of these inferences concerning the adequacy of past and current practices and implications for change in theological education. Nevertheless, the major concern of the study is to analyze, as objectively as possible, what has been and is in the belief that this is an important and necessary first step toward defining and realizing what might be.

---

[14] Education For Ministry, with the assistance of Thomas W. Klink, W. John Minter, and James D. Glasse (Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1966), p. 15. (Emphasis in the original.)

CHAPTER II

PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION: ISSUES AND AGENTS

In the preceding chapter, the purpose was to provide an overall view of the major concerns of this study. It was a look at the "forest" rather than the "trees," and, as such, it was necessarily somewhat superficial in its treatment of a number of complex issues. In this chapter attention is focused more on the "trees" themselves, especially on the basic theoretical assumptions which underlie the study. No attempt is made to treat the question of socialization into a profession in an exhaustive manner or to review all of the literature on professional socialization. Only those issues of theory and previous research which are pertinent to this study will be considered. In particular, two topics will receive the bulk of attention. The first is a consideration in more depth of the "what" of professional socialization; that is, what does it mean to be socialized into a profession? The second topic to be considered is the "how" of professional socialization; that is, the concern is with the agents and agencies of socialization, especially the professional schools.

I. SOCIALIZATION AND PROFESSIONAL SOCIALIZATION

Professional socialization, as it was defined in the preceding chapter, is a sub-type of the process of occupational socialization, which is, itself, a sub-type of the much more general socialization process. At this most general level, socialization may be defined as "the process by which persons acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that make them more or less able members of their society."[1]

Socialization theory, following the pioneering work of such men as Charles H. Cooley and George Herbert Mead, rests on the assumption that the self is fundamentally social, that it is formed in the processes of interaction with others.[2] This is not to imply that the self is accounted for solely in terms of society or that one is ever fully socialized. Dennis Wrong has trenchantly criticized the tendency of some sociologists to neglect those aspects of man which are resistant to socialization--for example, material interests, sexual drives and the quest for power; rather, he has stressed that man, while social, is not entirely socialized.[3] Even if the self were entirely socialized, in such a highly pluralistic socio-cultural milieu as contemporary western society, there would be a considerable variety of types of social selves. Indeed, socio-cultural pluralism, along with those resistant aspects of man's nature which Wrong mentions, contributes to the lack of "success" in the complete socialization of the self. Nevertheless, the concern of this study is with socialization (without assuming total success) and with the interpersonal and sociocultural influences in the development of the self (without implying that these are the only influences).

---

[1] Orville G. Brim, Jr., "Socialization Through the Life Cycle," _Socialization After Childhood, Two Essays_, Orville G. Brim, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p. 3.

[2] See especially Charles H. Cooley, _Human Nature and the Social Order_ (New York: Scribner's, 1902), Chapter 5; and George H. Mead, _On Social Psychology, Selected Papers_, ed. Anselm Strauss (Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1964), pp. 199-246.

[3] "The Oversocialized Conception of Man," _American Sociological Review_, XXVI (April, 1961), pp. 183-193.

By far the major attention of theoretical and empirical concern with socialization has been given to childhood socialization, and it is generally accepted that it is in the early years of an individual's life-span that the most significant and lasting impact of society is made upon him. Increasingly, however, attention has been turned to continuing processes of socialization, not only beyond childhood into adolescence, but throughout the entire life-cycle. As William H. Sewell has pointed out, it was particularly the merger of socialization theory with role theory (that is, the recognition that socialization is the process by which the individual learns and is motivated to perform social roles) that brought the awareness of the fact that socialization continues through the life-cycle.[4] Persons have to be socialized into retirement roles even as they have to be socialized into marital and occupational roles. In only an extremely static (and probably non-existent) society could an individual possibly be prepared in childhood for the multiplicity of social roles he will be called to enact throughout the life-cycle. Indeed, given the rate of change in modern industrial (or, perhaps, post-industrial) society, new roles--occupational and otherwise--arise which can hardly be foreseen during the childhood of most individuals. Therefore, socialization must be understood as an on-going, life-cycle process.[5]

---

[4] William H. Sewell, "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 349 (September, 1963), p. 173.

Are there differences between early socialization and that which occurs in later life? One possible kind of difference, which is not so much a difference in the process but in the individual being socialized, is the capability of the individual to undergo later life socialization. That is, as Brim points out, the biological capacities of the individual at various stages in the life-cycle, plus the effects of earlier learning, set limits on the individual's capability of undergoing new socialization experiences.[6] There may be some "new tricks" an "old dog" cannot learn; nevertheless, as Brim suggests, the exact nature of these limitations is unknown.

A second difference between early and later-life socialization has to do with the content of the socialization experience. There are, obviously, differences in what people learn at different stages of the life-cycle. Brim distinguishes six possible differences. They include the shift: (1) in content from a concern with values and motives to a concern with overt behavior; (2) from acquisition of new material to a synthesis of the old; (3) from a concern with idealism to a concern with realism; (4) from teaching expectations to teaching how to meditate conflict among expectations; (5) from a concern with general demands of a society to a concern with role-specific expectations; and (6) from "I-me" components of personality to other components (that is, away from the kinds of experiences which shape the basic identity of the individual being socialized).[7]

---

[5] A very good discussion of the varieties of later life socialization and its similarities and differences from early socialization is found in Orville G. Brim, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 3-49.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 20-24.

Reflecting a recognition of such differences, some theorists refer to early socialization as "primary" socialization and consider later life socialization as "secondary."[8] The "primary" nature of socialization in early childhood has reference to the fact that it is at this time, as Berger and Luckmann express it, that "the individual's first [social] world is constructed,"[9] and his basic identity is shaped. "Secondary socialization is any subsequent process that inducts an already socialized individual into new sectors of the objective world of his society."[10] This is to say that in primary socialization, the basic values, the fundamental world-view, of an individual are formed. In contrast, in secondary socialization, as Brim has indicated, there is primarily the learning of specific knowledge and overt behavior patterns for the performance of roles.

---

[7] Ibid., pp. 24-33.

[8] Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, The Social Construction of Reality (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 129 ff.

[9] Ibid., p. 135.

[10] Ibid., p. 130.

While these distinctions between early and later life socialization are fundamentally accurate, it should not be inferred that no socialization of a relatively primary sort occurs in later life. Religious conversion, psychoanalysis, and the "brainwashing" of prisoners of war may be cited as dramatic examples of primary socialization or resocialization in later life.[11]

Rather than using the distinction between primary and secondary socialization, Wheeler, following Bidwell, distinguishes between _role_ socialization and _status_ socialization, which have reference to the specificity or generality of the goals of the socialization experience.[12] By role socialization is meant training and preparation for the performance of specific tasks, and by status socialization is meant "a broader pattern of training designed to prepare the recruit to occupy a generalized status in life with its associated life styles."[13] Wheeler cites training in engineering, typing, or forestry as examples of role socialization, while training in the liberal arts "is an example of status socialization, preparing the recruit with some of the general background necessary to enact the status of college graduate."[14]

---

[11] See Peter L. Berger, _Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective_ (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc.), pp. 50-52.

[12] Charles E. Bidwell, "Pre-Adult Socialization" (paper presented at the Social Science Research Council Conference on Socialization and Social Structure, May, 1962), cited in Stanton Wheeler, "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," _Socialization Through the Life Cycle_, _op. cit._, pp. 69-70.

[13] _Ibid._, p. 70.

Given these various distinctions regarding the temporal and content aspects of socialization, how do they relate to professional socialization? It is obvious that professional socialization has some characteristics of what has been called secondary or role socialization. There is a certain body of knowledge to be learned and skills to be developed which prepare one for the performance of given professional roles. Furthermore, there is no necessary implication in such learning of knowledge and skills that any relatively primary socialization need occur. However, in the definition of professional socialization cited in the preceding chapter, attention is called not only to learning the requisite knowledge and skills, but also to the development of a "professional self" which governs behavior in a wide variety of situations involving both professional and extra-professional situations.[15] That is, even when he is officially "off duty" and not involved explicitly in professional practice, the professional is likely to think and behave (or be expected to do so) in reference to his internalized professional values, norms, and attitudes. The extent to which there is the development of a "professional self" implies a type of primary or status socialization.

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Merton, et al., op. cit., p. 287.

Similar conclusions are suggested in considering the professional attributes listed in Chapter One. To be a professional involves having a relatively high degree of "esoteric" knowledge and skill in order to perform in the professional role. Thus, much of professional socialization, including much that occurs during the period of formal professional education, is secondary or status socialization. Nevertheless, the attributes of a professional include also the expectations of responsibility, self-direction, a service orientation, and a sense of calling or commitment to the occupation. As Everett Hughes has pointed out,

> Since the professional does profess [i.e., professes to know better than others the nature of certain matters, and to know better than his clients what ails them or their affairs], he asks that he be trusted. The client is not a true judge of the value of the service he receives. . . . A central feature, then, of all professions, is the motto . . . credat emptor.[16]

This is to suggest further the reasons for viewing professional socialization as involving more than secondary or role socialization. The development of trustworthiness, of responsibility, of self-direction, of a service orientation, of commitment or a sense of calling to the profession involves something approaching primary socialization or, perhaps better, status socialization.

To be sure, it need not be a totally new set of values and norms that is internalized by the aspiring professional. Professional socialization often "builds on" to prior socialization experiences. An important function of the selection policies of a profession is the "weeding out" of those who have "undesirable" values and norms from the standpoint of the profession.[17] Nevertheless, where rigorous selection procedures are not practiced, or where the profession places high salience on the personal qualities of the professional, the socialization experience takes on a relatively "primary" character. As will be discussed in more detail below, the traditional Roman Catholic emphasis on the "spiritual formation" of candidates for the priesthood, within the context of an institution segregated from contacts with the "world," is an extreme example of a rigorous attempt at resocialization. A similar intention of resocialization, within a quite different context, was for many years (and still is to some extent) exhibited in the rigors of the "Thayer System," as the educational philosophy was called, at the United States Military Academy at West Point.[18] In both of these examples, the traditional Roman Catholic seminary and the military academy, the concern for shaping the values and norms of the recruits was undertaken in the extreme. Indeed "brainwashing" is not too strong of a description of the process! Such extreme measures are the exception rather than the rule in most professional socialization; nevertheless, there is, in most professions, the concern for the inculcation of values and norms which goes beyond the transmission of knowledge and skills.

---

[16] "Professions," Daedalus, XCII (Fall, 1963), pp. 656-657.

---

[17] See Etzioni, op. cit., p. 156 f. Also, see Anthony P. M. Coxon, "Sociological Processes of Clergy Selection" (unpublished mimeographed paper read at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, May, 1969).

[18] See John P. Lovell, "From Seminary to University: Organizational Change at the Nation's Service Academies" (unpublished working paper #27, Center for Social Organization Studies, University of Chicago, May, 1964).

It must be acknowledged, however, that some students of the professions have questioned the significance of this emphasis. Jerome P. Carlin, in his provocative study of the New York Bar,[19] maintains that the lasting effects of professional socialization in the internalization of ethical codes have been idealized and exaggerated. His findings with respect to lawyers suggest that it is the structure of the legal practice (e.g., types of clients and types of courts) rather than internalized values and norms that determines to a considerable extent the ethical behavior of lawyers. Similarly Becker and his associates, in their analysis of medical education,[20] question the importance of medical school in providing the student with the attitudes and values necessary for professional practice. The position the authors take is that, on the one hand, they (the authors) do not "know what attitudes and values will help the student adjust most easily and adequately to the professional role he is going to play" to be able to understand and interpret how such values and attitudes might be internalized during the socialization process. On the other hand, it strikes them as highly speculative that "certain things are learned latently which will have an effect on the student's behavior in the distant future."[21]

---

[19] Lawyer's Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar, (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966), especially Chapter One.

[20] Howard S. Becker, et al., Boys in White, Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

These criticisms of what can be called a "functionalist" theory of professional socialization[22] will enter the discussion again in the following section. For the present, it can be admitted that the criticisms have considerable merit. It is easy to overemphasize the picture of the autonomous, inner-directed professional,[23] or of a highly cohesive professional association which closely controls its members.[24] In a society as complex, as highly differentiated, and rapidly changing as modern industrial society, such pictures are idealized and unrealistic. Nevertheless, in defense of the importance attached to professional socialization, especially in the sense of being relatively primary or status socialization (as defined above), several points may be mentioned.

---

[21] Ibid., p. 420.

[22] So called because of association with various sociologists who are "functionalist" or "structural-functionist" in theoretical perspective (e.g., Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, W. J. Goode, Wilbert E. Moore, etc.), and, more especially, because these theorists have placed considerable emphasis on internalized professional values and norms and their functions in enabling self-directed behavior and in maintaining the integration of professional communities. For example, see Goode, "Community Within A Community: The Professions," American Sociological Review, XX (1957), pp. 194-200.

[23] Dennis Wrong's critique, op. cit., pp. 183-192, is quite applicable to some discussions of professional autonomy and professional ethics.

[24] See Rue Bucher and Anselm Strauss, "Professions in Process," The American Journal of Sociology, LXVI (January, 1961), pp. 325-334.

It is not inaccurate, I believe, to acknowledge that the intention, explicitly stated, of a considerable number of those responsible for professional socialization, is the inculcation of values and norms through the socialization processes. It seems important to take their "definition of the situation" into account. To fail to do so, whatever one's opinion of the success of such an endeavor, would be to overlook a significant aspect of professional socialization as ideally defined by those responsible for it. Furthermore, as Moore and Rosenblum have pointed out, ". . . ideal values and norms are not made irrelevant by failures to achieve them. That could only be argued if a radical change or outright abandonment of professed ideals would have no consequence for behavior, and that we do not believe to be the case."[25] Empirical data from various sources, including the present study, suggest that it is not an entirely speculative matter to assert that values and norms internalized in the past (latently or otherwise) do influence subsequent behavior, even if the values and norms are sometimes honored in the breach.[26] Therefore, while acknowledging the validity of the criticisms of an overemphasis on professional socialization, I would nevertheless agree with those who see the process as more than secondary or role socialization.

---

[25] Op. cit., Chapter I, p. 22.

[26] See, for example, Ernest Q. Campbell, "The Internalization of Moral Norms," Sociometry, XXVII (December, 1964), pp. 391-412. Also

To be more explicit, however, what does it mean to view professional socialization as status or relatively primary socialization? As previously mentioned, this implies a somewhat diffuse development of the socializee, sometimes to the point of changing or shaping his fundamental values and attitudes. In Chapter One, I used the concept of the "professional self" because of its diffuse, rather than specific, connotations. That is, to speak of the development of the "self" involves more than the learning of various role expectations.

In a conference on professional education, Kenneth R. Andrews made a statement in reference to business education which, in a general sense, is an excellent description of what I mean by the concept "professional self." Emphasizing that the transmission of specific content was not the most basic concern of professional education, Andrews said, "We aim . . . to produce a point of view, a set of values, a power of the mind, and a taste for further learning, not encyclopedic knowledge."[27] It is particularly the emphasis

---

see Ernest Q. Campbell and Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Racial and Moral Crisis: The Role of Little Rock Ministers," The American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (March, 1959), pp. 509-516. The latter article illustrates the conflict which can ensue between situational constraints and internalized standards.

[27] Kenneth R. Andrews, "The Progress of Professional Education for Business," Theological Education, V (Spring, 1969), pp. 155-156.

on the shaping of "a point of view, a set of values, a power of the mind" which suggests what I intend generally by the concept of professional self.

A similar point is made, perhaps somewhat less explicitly, in Thomas Kuhn's important work on the history of science.[28] Kuhn speaks of scientific "paradigms" which are universally recognized scientific achievements about which doubt is suspended, and which provide model problems and solutions to a community of scientific practitioners.[29] For present purposes, the important point which Kuhn makes (and illustrates historically) is that paradigms embody world-views.[30] To accept a paradigm is to accept a way of looking at and responding to the world. The paradigm is a perspective, a gestalt, through which experience is perceived and interpreted, and to change one's paradigm (i.e., to be "converted" to a new paradigm) is to change the world which the scientist sees. The professional education of the scientist, which Kuhn discusses briefly at several points, involves a training in perception until the world of the student's research is seen through the paradigm of his scientific community:

> Looking at a bubble-chamber photograph, the student sees confused and broken lines, the physicist a record of familiar sub-nuclear events. Only after a number of such transformations

---

[28] The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[29] Ibid., p. x.

[30] Ibid., pp. 110-134.

> of vision does the student become an inhabitant of the scientist's world, seeing what the scientist sees and responding as the scientist does.[31]

Such restructuring of perception, while obviously highly cognitive, involves more than cognition, as Kuhn's use of conversion as an analogy suggests.[32] It involves, in a rather fundamental way, what Andrews referred to as the "shaping of a point of view." Similarly, and with specific reference to the education of ministers, Paul Holmer has described the basic concern of theological education as enabling ministers to "intend the world as Christians." Writes Holmer, "The minister needs to be taught the faith, not just about it; he needs the language of faith, not just more about it."[33]

In short, then, it is the shaping of a point of view, the structuring of perception, coming to intend the world in a particular way, which is what I mean when I say that professional socialization involves the development of the professional self. Obviously, what this implies specifically will vary from profession to profession, but at the general level, it does not seem unreasonable to use these various illustrations to give some meaning to the term. As I indicated previously, the specific content given to professional self with reference to the ministry in this study has to do with basic theological orientations, social-ethical perspectives, and images of the ministry. These have been tentatively defined above, and their fuller explication will be considered more appropriately in later chapters.

---

[31] Ibid., p. 110; see also pp. 163 ff.

[32] Ibid., pp. 149 ff.

[33] "Can We Educate Ministers Scientifically?" The Making of Ministers, Essays on Clergy Training Today, eds. Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964), p. 17.

What remains to be considered now is the very important question: what contributes to the shaping of professional selves, or points of view? I have already indicated that professional socialization is a long-term and complex process which begins long before and extends for a considerable time after the period of formal professional education. Obviously then, the professional self is a product of many experiences over a considerable period of time. Nevertheless, since the concern of this study is with the formal period of socialization which, for ministers, occurs in the context of the theological seminary, the remainder of this chapter is given over to a consideration of some theoretically important aspects of theological schools as formal agencies of socialization.

II. AGENCIES OF SOCIALIZATION

To narrow the concern of this section (and of the study in general) to the role of the theological schools in the development of the professional self constitutes a considerable delimitation of focus. Nevertheless, even such a relatively restricted focus as this is still too broad when one considers the range of potentially important variables in the organization and environment of theological schools and other similar formally organized agencies of socialization. This variety of possibilities is well illustrated in two recent attempts to develop a framework of analysis for educational institutions and other agencies of socialization.

The first, Allen H. Barton's monograph, *Organizational Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments*,[34] is an attempt to codify a number of organizational studies under major substantive headings, and to consider ways in which various researchers have measured and analyzed organizational variables. An abbreviated outline of the major types of variables discussed by Barton is indicative of some of the possibilities open to the researcher in considering agencies of socialization:

I. Inputs

    A. Human inputs (faculty, administrators and trustees, students)
    B. Economic inputs
    C. Physical facilities

II. Outputs (immediate and long-run effects on students)

III. Environmental Variables

IV. Social Structure

    A. Formal authority structure
    B. Influence structure
    C. Communications and work contacts
    D. Informal social relationships
    E. Division of labor and departmentalization
    F. Size
    G. Formal living arrangements

---

[34] (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961).

V. Attitudes

  A. Organizational goals and values
  B. Norms governing organizational roles
  C. Perceptions of organizational characteristics
  D. Satisfaction with role or organization

VI. Activities

  A. Individual role behavior
  B. Collective activities
  C. Administrative devices

A similar type of analysis, oriented more towards comparative theoretical concerns than measurement considerations, is found in the previously cited essay by Stanton Wheeler, "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings."[35] Wheeler's analysis is broken into two types of variables, structural aspects of the organization which can be measured cross sectionally at a single point in time, and processual aspects, that is, aspects of organizational life which relate to movement through the structure. Among the former, Wheeler includes organizational goals, the composition of the recruit population, interaction rates, role differentiation and the formation of subcultures, the setting and external environment, and the social climate. As process variables, Wheeler includes anticipatory socialization,[36] entry procedures, the amount and sources of knowledge about recruits, role failures and their fate, the length of time and the timing of the process, exit procedures, organizational control and the recruits later career, and chains and sequences of socialization.

---

[35] *Op*. *cit*., pp. 51-116.

[36] Anticipatory socialization, in this context, refers to the socialization that occurs prior to the recruit's entry into the socializing organization and/or the profession. During this time he anticipates becoming a member of the organization and/or profession, and, therefore, to some extent he comes to know what

What is evident from both of the above examples is that there are a variety of aspects of formally organized agencies of socialization that are both theoretically and practically important and interesting. Nevertheless, it is also clear that to consider all of these organizational aspects in one study, even if techniques of analysis were adequate to do so, would involve either a monumentally long or a superficially brief undertaking. Since neither type of undertaking is the aim of this study, a further delimitation is necessary. Specifically, it is necessary to select from the range of possibilities those variables potentially affecting the socialization process which seem most central to the organization. Also, it is necessary to attempt to select for study variables which potentially summarize, or are highly associated with, other non-studied aspects of the organization. Such delimitation, in spite of the oversimplification involved, hopefully will lead to a more depth understanding of a few variables rather than risking a superficial treatment of a larger number. With these criteria in mind, I have chosen to limit my attention primarily, though not exclusively, to one major aspect

---

he is supposed to experience before he has actually experienced it. Such information comes through the example and words of others and through reading about the organization or profession.

of seminaries as formally organized agencies of socialization.

A central feature of formal organizations, whether they are organizations that socialize people or not, is that they have a limited and ordered mission or set of goals.[37] That is, in contrast to social structures which arise more or less naturally through the continued interaction of individuals, some social structures are rationally planned to accomplish a particular task.[38] Formal agencies of socialization, such as theological seminaries, fall into this latter category. They are more or less rationally planned for the accomplishment of specific educational or socialization goals.

While it is a relatively simple matter to assert that the primary goal of formally organized agencies of professional socialization is to socialize professionals, this assertion, as is obvious, is relatively meaningless as it stands. What is lacking is a specification of the penultimate or proximate goals which indicate more concretely what those responsible for socialization aim to accomplish. Yet, as significant as these penultimate goals are for what occurs in the process of socialization, one frequently encounters considerable difficulty in trying to discern what they are. As Hughes has written:

---

[37] Although the literature on formal organizations has generally provided abundant precedent for referring to the organization's mission as its "goal" or "purpose," it is technically incorrect to do so. Goals, as the term is generally used, are subjective intentions, usually having reference to alternative future states of affairs. As such, having goals can only legitimately be attributes of individuals. Organizations cannot have subjective intentions, unless one conceives of organizations anthropomorphically. It does seem defensible, however, to use the term "goals" with reference to an organization if one keeps in mind that he is referring to preferences _of_ individuals who constitute the organization _for_ some conceived alternatives for the organization over other possible alternatives. Thus one may refer to the goals of an organization as being the preferences of individuals for the organization of which they are a part. It is in this sense that I will use the term goals with reference to theological seminaries as formal or complex organizations. I am indebted especially for clarification of this point to discussions with Anthony Smith and Jan Smith of Princeton University. Also, see Eric Rhenman, "Organizational Goals," _Acta Sociologica_, X (Fasc. 3-4, 1967), pp. 275-287.

[38] Peter Blau contrasts these two types of social structures, referring to them as "emergent" and "goal focussed" structures respectively. See _Exchange and Power in Social Life_ (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1967), p. 313.

> Compared to the restrictions, resistances and distortions of purpose, assignments, and efforts in a school, a mental hospital, a social agency or a prison, the much studied restriction of production is simplicity itself. In the factory, there is at least a fair consensus about what the object produced shall be. There is often no consensus in institutions where things are done for or to people.[39]

This dilemma, to which Hughes points, is a real one. Even where there may be general consensus regarding the proximate goals (which is infrequently the case), there may be considerable dissensus concerning the relative weight to be given to these proximate goals, that is, how they should be ordered as to priority of emphasis. Thus the difficulty of specifying the goals of socialization agencies, such as theological seminaries, is a difficult one; nevertheless, since the goals influence to a considerable extent the organization of the agency, this must be attempted. In the next chapter, as I have indicated, an attempt will be made to derive an inductive classification of goals of theological education in order that the seminaries included in the sample may be typed and their influence in socialization assessed. In order to accomplish this task, it is first necessary to suggest how goals, which are abstractions, are translated into structural constraints in the socialization process.

---

[39] Everett C. Hughes, Men and Their Work (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), p. 76.

One possible way of answering this question would be to consider the technical apparatus--the methods, techniques and facilities used in socialization agencies to accomplish the goals. Since the concern is with educational institutions, the technical apparatus would include the structure and content of curricula, pedagogical methods, formal rewards and sanctions, physical facilities, etc. If one had a relatively clear statement of the goals of the socialization agency, then he might be able to assess the extent to which this technical apparatus is commensurate with the announced goals. As important as this might be, I suggest that it would not adequately answer the question as to how the goals are translated into structural constraints and are experienced as such by the recruits. The answer lies, I believe, at a more subtle level.

These goals are goals of the individuals who make up the personnel of the socialization agency. They are goals which the individuals hold for the institutions. While the technical apparatus to some extent expresses these goals, the goals are more than this apparatus. They become to some extent expressed in what, following

Wheeler,[40] may be called the "social climate" or "ethos" of the organization. Philip Selznick has suggested that "organizations become fused with value as they come to symbolize the community's aspirations, its sense of identity."[41] Similarly, Burton Clark and Martin Trow have noted that some educational institutions develop historically in such a manner that they come to have clearly distinguishable institutional "characters" or "identities," with traditions, values, and norms that differentiate them from other outwardly comparable institutions.[42] This "social climate" or "identity," I suggest, may be thought of as the embodiment of the goals which the persons within or responsible for the organization have for the organization in its socializing mission.

These persons holding the goals are, first of all, the administrators and staff (faculty) of the agency, along with persons in the larger organization, if any, which the socialization agency serves. Since these persons are more permanent members of the agency than the recruits or students who pass through, they are primary carriers of the social climate. The recruits, too, especially the ones with longer tenure in the organization, are also carriers of the climate.

---

[40] "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," *op. cit.*, p. 81 ff. Coleman used the concept "value climate" in his study of adolescent society as a means of differentiating types of adolescent cultures in various schools. While the measures are different which I am using in this study, the general concept is similar. See James S. Coleman, *The Adolescent Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1961), especially Chapter III. See also Barton, *op. cit.*, pp. 42-44, for a similar discussion of this concept.

[41] *Leadership in Administration* (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957), p. 20.

[42] "The Organizational Context," *College Peer Groups*, eds. Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 35-39. See also Wheeler, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

The reference to persons as carriers of the social climate suggests that this climate or ethos is not quite the mystical entity that it might first have appeared to be. Emile Durkheim has perhaps made the most important contribution to an understanding of how the values and norms of _individuals_ in a collectivity become externalized as _common_ values and norms and feed back upon the acting and thinking of the individuals as external constraints.[43] While acknowledging that "social consciousness exists only in individual minds," Durkheim maintains, however, that the collective expression of individual consciousness is "_external to each average individual taken singly_."[44] This is to say that, while it is only individuals who have values and norms, when they interact, especially over periods of time, their common values and norms become externalized as social values and norms, and they are experienced by the individual as external structural constraints. Thus, while held by individuals, the shared values and norms become external to and independent of each individual taken singly. Recent students of Durkheim have referred to this phenomenon as "structural" or "compositional" effects,[45] and have suggested techniques for its analysis. These techniques are discussed in Chapter Two.

---

[43] See Emile Durkheim, _Suicide_, translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson (New York: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 309-320, for one of Durkheim's clearest discussions of this perspective.

[44] _Ibid._, p. 316 (Emphasis in original).

Since the social climate has its grounding primarily in the individuals who make up the organization, it is obvious that the "reality" and "strength" of the social climate are affected by the degree of consensus shared by various members of the organization. Nevertheless, even when there is some dissensus at a given time, a particular social climate or institutional "identity" may persist by the sheer weight of tradition and continue to function as a structural constraint.

This suggests that persistence of the identity or climate of an organization seems not only to be a function of the degree of consensus among the organization's present inhabitants. The social climate often becomes a part of the tradition, the institutional lore of the organization, and it often continues even when there is a turnover of personnel.[46] The organization becomes known in the environing society as having this or that type of social climate or identity, and this reputation in turn feeds back into the organization as expectations which interested persons, often alumni, have for the organization. Also the reputed social climate often influences the choices of prospective recruits to the organization, to the extent that they have knowledge of the organization prior to entry, and these recruits further reinforce the identity of the organization with the expectations which they bring.

---

[45] See Peter M. Blau, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, XXV (April, 1960), pp. 178-193; and James A. Davis, Joseph L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson, "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition," American Sociological Review, XXVI (1961), pp. 215-225.

[46] Clark and Trow, loc. cit., illustrate this point with reference to various colleges which have distinctive social climates of long standing, e.g., Reed and Swarthmore Colleges.

To recapitulate, I have hypothesized that the goals of organizations become expressed as the social climate or ethos, and that the social climate is experienced as a structural constraint by the recruits in the organization. This is to say, then, that the goals of the socializing agency are embodied in and expressed, not only through the formal technical apparatus (curriculum, pedagogical methods, facilities, etc.), but also through the social climate.

The question may now be raised as to how social climates affect the socialization process? Here again, only a partial answer will be attempted. I will emphasize what seems to me to be a central aspect of the effects of social climate on the recruits in the organization.

The social climate expresses to some extent the goals of the organization. More precisely, the social climate expresses the dominant goals which individuals related to the organization have for the socializing mission of the organization. These individuals include different status groups--trustees, administration, faculty, alumni, upperclassmen, student peers, etc. Assuming for a moment that these varying status groups, especially the faculty and students, are more or less united in their expectations regarding goals (which is a precarious assumption), then it seems plausible to assume that most new recruits to the organization would adapt themselves to these dominant expectations, other things being equal. As Becker and his associates suggest, "When an organization's hierarchy clearly reflects the operation of a value . . . participants in that organization are likely to gauge their own worth by the amount of value they possess."[47] Indeed, this adaptation to the dominant expectations regarding the goals of the organization may have begun for many recruits prior to entry into the organization. Depending on their amount of information regarding the organization prior to entry, they may have selected the organization because of their knowledge of its social climate or ethos. Whether such self-selection and/or anticipatory socialization occur or not, it is highly probable that most recruits will adapt themselves to organizational expectations upon entry.

Becker and his associates refer to this adaptation to organizational expectations in terms of the development of a "perspective," which is defined as

> a coordinated set of ideas and actions a person uses in dealing with some problematic situation. . . . These thoughts and actions . . . form the underlying rationale for the person's actions and are seen by the actor as providing a justification for acting as he does.[48]

---

[47] Becker, _et al_., _Boys in White_, _op_. _cit_., pp. 259-60.

[48] _Ibid_., p. 34.

What Becker and his associates mean by "perspectives" is similar to what I will call here the student's "philosophy of theological education," that is, his ranking of the goals of theological education in terms of their importance for himself as he adapts to (or deviates from) the dominant social climate of the seminary.[49]

One point should be made regarding a difference between the position taken here and that of Becker and his associates. These authors were primarily concerned with perspectives which were short-term or temporary responses to problematic situations within the school rather than a more fundamental response which might continue to influence later professional practice.[50] The philosophies of theological education which are considered in this study, however, are responses, not simply to problematic situations in the school, but to the basic expectations regarding the meaning and purpose of the socialization experience, which are what the social climate embodies. In essence, it might be said, with reference to theological education, that styles of ministry are involved in the philosophies, as will become more clear in subsequent chapters. Also, there is reason to infer that there are some differences in the kinds of involvements and participation in the life of the theological school by persons holding different philosophies of theological education or responding to different social climates. This, too, will be considered in later chapters.

---

[49] See Richard E. Peterson, "On A Typology of College Students (Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J., March, 1965), pp. 7-9. Peterson, utilizing Clark and Trow's typology of student subcultures, classifies individual students according to their philosophies of education. In essence, students were classified as having this or that philosophy in terms of their ranking of a list of goals of higher education. I have, as will become evident in Chapter Four, followed Peterson's method to some extent. I am grateful, not only for his published work, but also for helpful personal conversations and suggestions.

[50] Becker, *et al.*, *Boys in White*, *op. cit.*, pp. 430-433.

To return now in summary to the major argument of this section, I have chosen to focus on the goals of the agency of socialization, that is, on the desired socialization outcomes held by individuals making up the organization. These desired outcomes or expectations, as they are shared, become expressed in what I have referred to as the social climate of the organization, which is experienced by recruits to the organization as a structural constraint. Assuming for simplicity the limiting case of complete unanimity regarding goal expectations or social climate, I suggested further that new recruits would adapt themselves to the social climate upon entry (if not prior to entry in an anticipatory fashion) by adapting a personal philosophy of theological education consonant with the social climate. This philosophy, I suggest, helps to shape the kinds of involvement and participation in the life of the school, as well as being expressive of a particular style or understanding of ministry. In later chapters both personal philosophies and social climates will be examined in relation to the dependent variables of the study.

While this basic theoretical perspective is perhaps simple enough, unfortunately the real world is infinitely more complex.

There are many potential "little foxes that spoil the vine" and make the organizational impact on socialization much more contingent and problematic. The previous references to Barton's outline of organizational variables and the discussion by Wheeler make clear the oversimplifications which this theoretical perspective represents. Even with reference to social climates, I have not developed propositions, for example, to account for variations in the "strength" of social climates nor for their persistence or change. Nor have I considered their congruence or lack of congruence with other aspects of the organizations and their environments. More important yet, there has been no indication of factors which lead to a differentiation of student philosophies within the same school, that is, the development of sub-cultures which either support or subvert the influence of the dominant social climate.[51] The theoretical perspective outlined above, therefore, is potentially useful only if one adds the qualification, _ceteris paribus_. However, rather than extending this discussion to give attention to other variables which, at a minimum, need to be considered, these additional variables will be introduced below at appropriate points in the elaboration of the data analysis. More important at this point is to turn to a consideration of the goals of theological education which, as I have hypothesized, become expressed in various types of social climates and influence the socialization experience. This is the subject of the following chapter.

---

[51] See Clark and Trow, _op_. _cit_., pp. 23-36, for their important discussion of types of student cultures in educational institutions.

CHAPTER III

THE GOALS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

There is a line from Marc Connelly's play, *Green Pastures*, which seems somewhat fitting as a preface to a discussion of the goals of theological education. The Angel Gabriel, after a survey of the world scene, reports disconcertedly that "Everything nailed down is comin' loose." As one surveys the contemporary scene in theological education, reads the discussions on the purpose of theological education by those responsible for the process, or examines catalogues and bulletins of theological schools, Gabriel's observation appears to be a fair assessment of the current state of theological education. That there is considerable ferment is beyond question. That there is general agreement concerning the major goals of theological education is considerably less certain. To be sure, there is agreement, as was indicated in the preceding chapter, that theological schools have as their overall mission the "making of ministers."[1] H. Richard Niebuhr defined this general purpose in more depth when he wrote:

---

[1] It is interesting and informative to note, however, that a recent collection of essays on theological education, which had as its title *The Making of Ministers*, nevertheless represented in its essays a considerable diversity of opinion as to what that overall goal implies when broken into more specific sub-goals. One of the few general areas of agreement was that theological schools are primarily, as the title implies, for *The Making of Ministers*. See Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver (eds.), *The Making of Ministers* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964).

> [Theological education], now as always, is concerned with the nurture of men and women whose business in life it will be to help men to see their immediate perplexities, joys and sufferings in the light of an ultimate meaning, to live as citizens of the inclusive society of being, and to relate their present choices to first and last decisions made about them in the totality of human history by Sovereign Power.[2]

This statement, as richly suggestive as it is in relating the over-all goal of theological education to the task of ministry, suggests, only by implication, what some of the concrete aspects of that over-all goal may be. It is, however, with these aspects, or sub-goals, as they are expressed in various types of social climates, that this chapter is concerned.

The current ferment in theological education, which covers at least the major period of time which the data of this study reflect, makes it exceedingly difficult for the researcher to develop generalizations concerning social climates of theological schools based on priorities of goals. After intensive analysis of the current state of theological education, which included visitation of a number of schools, one writer made the following observation:

> Few generalizations are possible about the schools, because they are so immensely various. Some schools appear to be completely immersed in their culture, others are highly critical of it. Some schools seldom change anything significant, others are in a ferment of change. In some schools the academic side dominates, in others the practical. In some schools the students are active ministers during long weekends, in others studies are week-long and no students are in charge of churches. Some schools are denominational through and through, some welcome

---

[2] The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), pp. 2-3.

> members of other denominations, some are interdenominational, some are non-denominational.[3]

Nevertheless, if one is to do more than describe the heterogeneity of types of schools in a series of discrete case studies of individual seminaries, then it becomes necessary for him to try to bring some ordering principles to bear upon the diversity of material. This is especially important if the question of interest is what difference does it make in the socialization process if the social climate or the institutional pattern of a seminary is "x" rather than "y." Since such comparative structural analysis of seminaries with reference to the socialization of clergy is the aim of this study, then it is necessary to try to develop categories by which some order may be given to the diverse material. The purpose of this chapter is to suggest one way in which these sub-goals of theological education may be classified and how individual seminaries may be categorized according to their ranking of the goals as to priority of emphasis.

I. THE GOALS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION--
AN HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

In Chapter One, four goals (or sub-goals) of theological education were briefly discussed. They included (1) mastery of the Christian tradition, (2) practical competence, (3) spiritual formation, and (4) secular awareness. Given the previously mentioned ferment and heterogeneity in theological education, the choice of these four emphases may seem rather arbitrary; however, reflection on historical and contemporary developments in theological education as well as various publications regarding theological education suggest that these four emphases are a helpful way of classifying central goals.[4]

---

[3] Charles R. Feilding, op. cit., p. 14.

---

[4] Several examples may be cited as indicative of some consensus:

(a) The late Henry Sloan Coffin was an acknowledged leader in American theological education. In his inaugural address, Coffin enunciated four goals of seminary education: (1) scholarship; (2) churchmanship; (3) worshipfulness; and (4) a passion for the world-wide kingdom of Christ. See Reinhold Niebuhr, This Ministry: The Contribution of Henry Sloan Coffin (New York: Scribner, 1945), p. 28.

(b) Yale Divinity School, which, like Union Theological Seminary in New York, is among the theological schools which have been pacesetters in American Protestant theological education, also expresses similar goals in the organization of its curriculum. The curriculum of the Bachelor of Divinity degree seeks to make available to the student: "(a) a sound knowledge of Christian scriptures; (b) an interpretation of the history and teachings of the Christian church; (c) a clear understanding of the people to whom [the clergyman] is to minister, their character, the culture, and their social institutions; and (d) skill, through instruction and guided practice, as a competent worker in particular church vocations. . . ." Yale Divinity School Bulletin, Series 62 (April, 1966), p. 29. The goal of "spiritual formation" is not considered; however, since this is a statement of curriculum objectives, it may be that this emphasis is not thought of as a curriculum matter.

(c) In his recent book on theological education, Charles R. Feilding suggests that professional education for ministry is a single task with four related goals, which he describes as (1) the acquisition of knowledge, (2) the development of professional skill, (3) personal (human) growth and (4) the deepening of Christian commitment. See Education for Ministry, op. cit., pp. 50, 149-172. The third goal which Feilding discusses is in part related to what I have called "secular awareness"; however, Feilding's emphasis is more on the personal human maturation of the student in self-understanding and openness to others (see especially pp. 161-162) than on

In this section, my purpose will be to trace the historical roots or the four emphases, with the aim of illuminating their current meaning for theological education. Since this is not primarily a study of the history of theological education, it is neither necessary nor feasible to engage in a lengthy treatment of the historical development of theological education. It would be foolish, however, to give the impression that one can understand the diversity in the current organization of theological schools without at least limited attention to the historical developments which lie behind the four goals of theological education mentioned above. It is helpful to consider each of these emphases as strands which have been woven into the fabric of contemporary theological education; however, the weaving has been done according to differing patterns, and the diversity of the current scene is the result.

---

understanding of the socio-cultural situation. The latter is included by Feilding under the goal of the acquisition of knowledge.

I cite these three examples, not as "proof-texts" to justify my choice of goals of theological education, but rather to emphasize that, in spite of dissensus and heterogeneity of emphasis among theological educators, there is some consensus as to the major goals. How the goals are to be ordered according to relative importance is not always a matter of agreement.

For other similar treatments, see William Adams Brown, Ministerial Education in America (Vol. I of The Education of American Ministers, eds. Mark A. May and William Adams Brown. 4 vols., New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934), pp. 95-98; and Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, Pre-Seminary Education (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965). For more detailed classifications of seminary goals, see Mark A. May, The Institutions That Train Ministers (Vol. III of The Education of American Ministers, eds. May and Brown, op. cit., pp. 31-33; and Hugh Hartshorne and Milton Froyd, Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention (Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1945), pp. 172-175.

Mastery of the Christian Tradition

The first strand--mastery of the Christian tradition--has grown out of the concern that ministers be equipped for their roles of preaching and teaching. Such an emphasis is obviously related to the characteristic of a professional as one who is master of a body of "esoteric" knowledge. It is especially the formal period of professional socialization undertaken by the theological school in which the aspiring professional is enabled to become a learned man *vis-à-vis* this body of knowledge. For the minister, this involves induction into the "mysteries" of such disciplines as biblical studies, the Greek and Hebrew languages, church history, the history of Christian doctrine, systematic theology, etc.

The emphasis on the mastery of the Christian tradition as a major goal of theological education is particularly an outgrowth of the Protestant Reformation. For Luther, Calvin, and the other leading figures in the "right wing" of the Protestant Reformation,[5] a literate and scholarly ministry was the aim. The ministry was *ministerium verbi*, and preaching and teaching within the gathered community of the church were the primary tasks. For this reason, the education of the clergy in both humanistic and theological disciplines assumed considerable importance. An educated clergy was deemed necessary to lead the common people in Christian faith and life.[6] The Geneva gown--a scholar's robe which the Calvinist clergymen adopted--is symbolic of this emphasis given to an educated clergy.

---

[5] The "right wing" of the Reformation refers principally to the Lutheran and Reformed traditions in distinction from the "left wing" or "free church" Reformation movements, including such groups as the Anabaptists and Mennonites.

To be sure, the Reformers did not originate the concern for an educated clergy. Beginning at least as early as Augustine's efforts to give already ordained clergy adequate intellectual training at his episcopal residence at Hippo,[7] there was a concern among Christians for an educated clergy. However, the sacerdotal image of the ministry, dominant in the Roman Catholic Church, never necessitated a widespread emphasis on a scholarly clergy to the extent that was true for the Lutheran and Calvinist branches of the Reformation with their emphasis on preaching and teaching.

It was this "right wing" Reformation tradition, refracted through English Puritanism, that was early to influence American theological education. Among the Congregationalists and Presbyterians in particular, the image of the minister was

---

[6] See Wilhelm Pauck, "The Ministry in the Time of the Continental Reformation," The Ministry in Historical Perspective, eds. H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel D. Williams (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), p. 124. The scholarly emphasis of the "right wing" of the Reformation was not shared by those groups in the "left wing" tradition. Accenting the ministry of the whole people of the congregation, the laos, these groups were hostile to a special professional education for the clergy and were determined that all the baptized were to be schooled in the Bible and Christian apologetics. See Franklin H. Littell, "Protestant Seminary Education in America," Seminary Education in A Time of Change, eds. Lee and Putz, op. cit., pp. 534-535.

[7] John Tracy Ellis, "A Short History of Seminary Education: I--The Apostolic Age to Trent," Seminary Education in A Time of Change, eds.Lee and Putz, op. cit., p. 4.

> . . . the prestigious image of the learned and installed-parson, the teaching elder of the gathered churches of the Massachusetts Bay and Plymouth colonies of sixteenth-century New England. These teaching elders were responsible primarily for the integrity of the Word and correctness of doctrine within the gathered community of the saints.[8]

That this scholarly image might be perpetuated when it became no longer feasible for candidates for the ministry to return to England for education, Harvard, Yale, and a number of other colleges were founded. The education given to the aspiring clergy in these colleges was broadly humanistic, much the same as that of non-ministerial students who were enrolled. Those entering the ministry would, upon graduation, remain at the colleges to "read" for the ministry under the tutelage of the President who was often a minister, or they would study further with some well-known minister of the day in an apprentice-like situation. There were, as yet, no formally established schools of theology.

Three factors, however, led to the differentiation of distinct theological schools from the regular "liberal-arts-plus apprenticeship" pattern. One factor was the growing recognition of the inadequacy of the older system to meet the demands of the churches for ministers, both quantitatively and qualitatively in terms of the kind of professional training needed. Thus, for example, between 1811 and 1816,

---

[8] Robert E. Cushman, "Theological Education, A Reconsideration of its Nature in Light of its Objective," The Duke Divinity School Review, XXXIII (Winter, 1968), p. 9.

Harvard Divinity School, as a separate department of the University, was established.[9]

The differentiation of Harvard Divinity School into a separate school of the college was, however, not the first instance of a separate school of theology. This occurred in 1774, with the establishment of a Dutch Reformed seminary at Flatbush, Long Island, New York, which later moved with its "faculty"--one Dr. John H. Livingston--to New Brunswick, New Jersey, where it eventually became known as the Seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick.[10] This establishment of the Dutch Reformed seminary reflects a second factor which led to the founding of theological seminaries as separate institutions--the concern of transplanted immigrant groups to continue to exercise the kind of control over their ministers that had been the case in the home country. This was to be especially true for the various strands of Lutheran immigrants. The emphasis on sound biblical scholarship and correct doctrine was quite strong among these groups. To preserve their distinctive emphasis, and, probably equally important, to preserve their ethnic self-consciousness in an alien land, they established their own colleges and seminaries which were often more "closed to the world" than their counterparts in the Reformed tradition.

---

[9] George H. Williams (ed), The Harvard Divinity School (Boston: Beacon Press, 1954), pp. 4-5. Williams points out, however, that the school still emphasized breadth of instruction in the classical tradition.

[10] William Adams Brown, Ministerial Education in America, op. cit., pp. 75-76. The one-man faculty indicates the difference between early theological schools and their later progeny. Early schools were usually quite small with only three or four faculty members at the most.

A similar concern to control, for sectarian purposes, the kind of education received by their ministers, was the third factor leading to the differentiation of separate theological schools. In 1808, conservative Congregationalists, disturbed by the rationalist Unitarian trends at Harvard, founded Andover Theological Seminary. The concern was still for an educated clergy--although as will be pointed out below, other concerns were also operative--but the denominations wished to control the kind of education which their ministers would receive. As William Adams Brown wrote:

> The example set by the Congregationalists at Andover was speedily followed by other denominations, and soon a score of denominational seminaries were in existence, each designated to perpetuate the special teaching of the sect it represented.[11]

This separation, while continuing the concern for an educated clergy, as was mentioned above, did lead in many instances to a diminution of the broadly classical and humanistic side of ministerial education which had been a part of the earlier pattern. As late as 1934, there were 136 Protestant seminaries that did not require a college degree for admission.[12] Nevertheless, concern for an educated clergy, however broadly or narrowly conceived, has been an important emphasis in the development of Protestant theological education in America.

---

[11] Quoted in Williams, op. cit., p. 5.

[12] See Brown, op. cit., p. 86. It should be noted, however, that 176 seminaries did admit only college graduates, and that of the 136 seminaries mentioned above, 98 stressed the importance of college graduation for admission without requiring it. The quality

Before turning to a second historical emphasis which profoundly influenced Protestant theological education in the United States, it is important to take note of a significant later development in the stress on a scholarly ministry, which was grafted on to the earlier concern. The earlier concern for a scholarly ministry in the United States had, apart from the broad liberal arts training, been focussed primarily on producing a minister disciplined in the biblical languages, exegesis, and doctrinal standards. This scholarly equipment, as has been pointed out, was primarily oriented towards the ministries of preaching and teaching of the gathered congregation. In short, the scholarly emphasis in theological education was wedded to the service of the church.

In Europe, however, a different direction had been taken. Especially in the German universities, theological faculties had come to be university-oriented rather than church-oriented. That is, they were oriented towards research and teaching, rather than towards the service of the institutional life of the church. Adolf Harnack expressed this orientation in his Inaugural Address at Berlin:

---

of the college education, however, varied considerably, as it continues to do so today, and there is no assurance that college graduation ensures a broad liberal education prior to entering seminary.

> We cannot and may not regard the teachings and needs of the churches in our historical work. We would forget our deity if we in a single instance had anything else in mind but the pure knowledge of the facts.[13]

In the nineteenth century, some American scholars were beginning to study in Germany and to bring back to American theological education the research-oriented point of view. While the complete divorce of theological education from a concern for the institutional church never occurred in the United States, the German influence did foster a certain independence from ecclesiastical control in some theological schools, so that theological scholars could work without fear of professional and ecclesiastical reprisals.[14]

In addition, however, the European influence brought an emphasis to the scholarly training of the clergy on the employment of scientific historiography in an understanding of both scripture and tradition. As Cushman has pointed out, "More than anything else, it is the espousal of scientific historiography, as the chief instrument of theological understanding, that styled ministerial education after the manner of the graduate schools of the humanities."[15] This change of emphasis, grafted on the older concept of the scholarly training of clergymen, has had important positive and negative consequences for theological education.

---

[13] Quoted in Littell, _op_. _cit_., p. 534.

[14] See F. Thomas Trotter, _op_. _cit_., p. 8.

[15] Cushman, _op_. _cit_., p. 15.

Positively, it has contributed to a wealth of scholarly research and writing which has enhanced the understanding, teaching and application of the Christian tradition. Furthermore, it has encouraged, as the above quotation from Cushman indicates, a return to a more broadly oriented and scholarly approach to theological education which had diminished somewhat during the rapid expansion of separate denominational schools of theology. To some extent dysfunctional, however, has been the encouragement of a certain discontinuity between the preparation for a scholarly ministry and the practice of ministry in a setting which, for various reasons, has not always included scholarly research among role expectations for the clergyman.

Spiritual Formation

Scholarly training, however conceived, is not the only emphasis which has influenced the shape of Protestant theological education in this country. Perhaps equally important has been a second historical strand: the concern with the personal sanctity of the clergyman, or what has been called "spiritual formation." While the two emphases have often gone hand in hand, it would be misleading to suggest that this has always been the case. The often quoted dictum of John Wesley, "Let us unite the two so long disjoined: knowledge and vital piety," is indicative that knowledge, even that of scripture and theology, has not always been wedded to a concern for the "vital piety" or sanctity of the clergy or laity.

Although the disjunction between the two emphases has not always occurred, it seems important to treat the stress on the personal sanctity of the minister as an independent variable in the development of Protestant theological education in the United States. This emphasis, as will become evident, has relevance for the previously discussed attributes of trustworthiness and responsibility expected of professionals. It also is closely related to the consideration of professional socialization as status rather than role socialization discussed in the preceding chapter.

By concern for the personal sanctity of the minister is meant an emphasis on the quality of his personal life. The emphasis is not on what he knows about his religious tradition or does in the practice of his profession so much as it is on what he is, on his personal being as a man of faith. This emphasis on personal qualities, though not entirely lacking from other professions (e.g., the stress on trustworthiness), is especially related to the minister's authority as a professional. H. Richard Niebuhr has expressed this clearly:

> As preachers of the gospel it is expected that [ministers] have experienced its power; as guides to the life of penitence and faith they need to know directly the nature of the humble and contrite heart. They cannot teach the law without being under the law nor unlovingly seek to increase love; when they attempt to do so their work lacks authority. Though the authority of experience and character is a gift of grace it is also achievement on the part of men who work out their salvation with fear and trembling because God works in them.[16]

It is not surprising, therefore, that personal sanctity or spiritual formation has been an important emphasis in theological education. Historically, there are at least two sources of this emphasis as a part of the training of ministers. While both spring from a common origin--that of the Judaeo-Christian concern for the inward, spiritual growth of the man of faith--the two sources may be mentioned separately.

---

[16] H. R. Niebuhr, The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry, p. 70.

The first comes out of the Roman Catholicism and has made its way into Protestant theological education primarily, though not exclusively, through the Anglican tradition. The emphasis on spiritual formation was formally decreed as a vital aspect of seminary education by the church fathers at the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century. Shamed by the moral laxity of many of the clergy, both secular and religious, the Tridentine fathers included, along with intellectual training, spiritual formation as a primary goal of seminary education. As Lee has written:

> . . . the Tridentine Fathers believed that the Latin term *seminarium* meant a 'seed-plot,' where the first beginning of priestly vocations could be sedulously nurtured and protected from the stifling and contaminating influence of a lukewarm and indifferent society. So far as possible, candidates for the priesthood were to be removed from 'the world' until they had sunk deep roots into the firm and rich soil of the clerical life.[17]

The priest, in his sacerdotal role, is understood to be called to a life of sanctity, to serve as the official mediator between the people and God, able to offer sacrifice and to serve as a special channel of grace. In Joseph Fichter's words, "The all-prevading goal of the religious functionary is the salvation of souls and the growth of God's kingdom--and his personal sanctity makes him an instrument for the sanctification of others."[18] The concern for the spiritual formation of the priest, however, has not been, for the Catholic, an individualistic emphasis, unrelated to the corporate body of the church. It is through his participation in the life of the church, its tradition and liturgy, that the novitiate is formed spiritually. This, as shall be pointed out below, has been in some contrast to the evangelical Protestant concern for sanctity.

---

[17] Lee and Putz (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. x.

More specifically, according to Fichter, the concern for spiritual formation in Catholic seminary training involves trying "to develop the virtues of reliability, generosity, thoughtfulness, sociability, sincerity, prayerfulness, docility and loyalty."[19] Such an emphasis as this has meant historically that in the Roman Catholic Church, "*The Seminary is not primarily the intellectual center of the Church's life; it is primarily that place, those years, wherein the seminarians are helped to devotional and spiritual maturity*."[20] This does not mean that the intellectual life has been neglected, but rather that it has been fused with the concern for the life of prayer and devotion.

---

[18] Joseph H. Fichter, S.J., *Religion as an Occupation* (South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961), p. 96. See also Edward Roche Hardy, "Priestly Ministries in Modern Church," *The Ministry in Historical Perspective*, eds. Niebuhr and Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 151, where it is pointed out that "The dignity of the priest comes from his union with the priestly work of his crucified Master, and is therefore only truly realized when the priestly life is in a real sense a life of sacrifice."

[19] Fichter, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

[20] Walter D. Waggoner, *The Seminary, Protestant and Catholic*

I have suggested that it has been primarily through the Anglican tradition that this particular strand of the concern for the sanctity of clergymen has been introduced into Protestant theological education. The Episcopal clergymen in this country were influenced by the evangelical conception of personal sanctity, to be considered below, and this has to some extent tempered the more Catholic emphasis and led to important differences in Episcopal churchmanship (e.g. "Broad" church vs. "High" church Episcopalians). Nevertheless, the Catholic emphasis on a church- or liturgically-centered piety has predominated, and it is reflected in contemporary Episcopal seminaries.

The other source of the emphasis on the personal sanctity of the clergyman as an aspect of theological education is, to say the least, somewhat different from the Roman Catholic tradition. It is, rather, primarily the fruit of the great revivals that played so decisive a role in American Protestantism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Out of this revivalist emphasis, with its great concern for preaching for conversions, an evangelical or charismatic image of the ministry developed. As one evangelical expressed it:

> the grand, the leading object of an evangelical ministry erywhere--[is] the conversion of the soul to God by the truth,

---

(New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), pp. 24-5 (emphasis in the original).

> the quickening of a spirit dead in sin by the preached gospel, the conversion and salvation of the lost by the mighty power of the Holy Spirit.[21]

In a voluntary church, that is, one not established as a state church but rather based on voluntary membership, conversions were a primary channel of new members, and the work of the minister tended increasingly to be judged by his effectiveness in securing conversions. Furthermore, as Sidney Mead points out, "long experience had provided a convincing demonstration that such success [in securing conversions] depended upon the religious state of the preacher." Mead quotes Gilbert Tennant, one of the important figures in the evangelical movement: "We only assert this, that success by unconverted Ministers' Preaching is very improbable, and very seldom happens, so far as we can gather. . . . since they themselves know nothing of the struggle of soul through which earnest seekers after God must go, they are but little help to those who are seeking God."[22]

This evangelical concern for the personal piety of the clergy, unlike the Roman Catholic tradition, has been much more individualistically oriented. A greater stress has been placed on the individual's personal relationship with God than a relationship mediated through the Church, as in the Roman Catholic tradition.[23]

---

[21] Cited in Sidney E. Mead, "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America (1607-1850)," The Ministry in Historical Perspective, eds., Niebuhr and Williams, op. cit., p. 229.

[22] Ibid., pp. 229-330.

[23] Fr. Louis Bouyer has contrasted this difference of emphasis in

In some instances, this evangelical tradition, with its emphasis on the personal sanctity of the ministry, has fostered an anti-intellectualism with regard to an educated clergy. A warm heart has been deemed more important than an informed mind, and, indeed, the latter has sometimes been thought to corrupt the former. A minority report adopted by the 1870 Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, vetoed an attempt to establish a central theological school for the denomination. The report stated that the tradition of theological schools

> has little that is favorable to Methodism, and much that is adverse. They have been fruitful sources of heresies innumerable, of a manner of preaching not generally desirable and rarely effectual among us, and of that formalism that never favors experiential religion. . . .[24]

The anti-intellectual tendencies in evangelical Protestantism did not always lead to such a firm stance against formal theological education. However, the suspicion of a liberal, rationalist orientation in the colleges, mentioned above, was combined with the concern for developing the sanctity of the clergy as motives in the formation

---

the following way: "Protestantism tends to produce a spirituality which springs entirely from the co-presence and mutual relationship between the Person of God revealed in the Christ of the Gospels and the individual person of the believer. But for Catholicism there is no fully authentic Christian spirituality without the realization of an equal co-presence of our fellow believers with Christ and ourselves, in the Church . . . ." Introduction to Spirituality (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1961), pp. 4 ff.

[24] Quoted in Robert S. Michaelson, "The Protestant Ministry in America: 1850 to the Present," op. cit., p. 276 (emphasis supplied).

of separate theological seminaries by many of the denominations. A further factor--that of ministers practically trained to meet the missionary demands which the revivals stirred--will be considered below.

In such separated schools the denominations could not only exercise control over the doctrine taught to their aspiring ministers, but they could also provide a context in which the personal piety of the men could be nourished. So it was that corporate worship, whether of the liturgical or "free" church traditions, a stress on personal devotions, prayer groups, prayers before classes, and other means of developing the sanctity of the students, were stressed in the Protestant seminaries.

Therefore, in spite of the important differences in the Catholic and evangelical Protestant understandings of the sanctity of the clergy, there is nevertheless some similarity both in the form of education undertaken and the quality of life sought for in the novitiates. Both traditions led to a concept of a separated seminary, although few Protestant seminaries ever attained to the closed, "total institutional" status of the traditional Roman Catholic seminary.[25]

---

[25] It is instructive to note that many of the denominational schools, established apart from any university relationships, adopted the term "seminary" as a part of their name, as opposed to "divinity school," which has more technically applied to a university related school of theology. Whether the choice of name was a conscious recognition of the "seed plot" connotation of the Latin seminarium or not, the result was often quite similar. Perhaps the closest American Protestant parallel to the traditional Roman

Furthermore, in the two approaches to sanctity, in spite of their theological differences, the emphasis has been on shaping the total status of the minister. It is his total being as a person, encompassing his several roles, that is to be formed spiritually. As will be pointed out below, the emphasis on sanctity or spiritual formation has not been equally strong in every Protestant seminary, and this, the data will show, is one of the important means of distinguishing between types of social climates. Nevertheless, the concern for sanctity has had an important influence on Protestant theological education, and it must be taken into consideration in understanding the goals of contemporary theological schools.

Practical Competence

A third historical strand which has been woven into American theological education must now be mentioned. It is, perhaps, the distinctively American emphasis, although to some extent it has earlier roots. It is the pragmatic or practical emphasis in the education of the clergyman, the concern that he be skilled in the art and craft of the practice of his profession. Ideally, as will be pointed out below, the aim is not solely the learning of practical

---

Catholic pattern of minor and major seminaries was in the traditional Missouri Synod Lutheran path to the ministry, which included parochial school, followed by attendance at one of the system of junior colleges, and capped by study at one of the M.S.L. seminaries. As one respondent in this study wrote in the margin of his questionnaire, "the whole system, from beginning to end, was a religious community."

skills--how to preach, how to be an administrator, how to conduct public worship, how to counsel. Equally as important is the internalization of the values legitimating these practitioner roles and the norms governing their performance.[26] Both of these aspects--the skills and their normative undergirding--are what I mean by the emphasis on practical competence, which, as mentioned above, is a predominantly American contribution to theological education.

In the Puritan period in England and in its counterpart in colonial America, there was, as has been noted, a concern for an educated ministry. The formal education, however, was primarily academic in orientation. Little concern was evidenced for educating the ministerial candidates in the practice of ministry. This was left, either to the individual's own "trial and error" learning or, more often, to learning through a form of apprenticeship with an experienced minister. In the colleges, it was said, one studied _for_ the ministry. As an "apprentice" to an experienced clergyman, one was trained _in_ the ministry.

---

[26] Of course, these values and norms are a part of (or are derived from) the minister's basic theological orientation. However, the often lamented split between theory (theology) and practice calls attention to the need for developing more explicit normative legitimation of practitioner roles. The following quotation from Peter Berger also suggests the need for explicit attention to legitimating the roles: "No matter what motives originally propelled him into theological study, the performances of the ministerial role will at first evoke in most students a sense of embarrassment and uneasiness. The minister walks around in an outlandish costume, and his principal activities are carried out in buildings carefully constructed to be outlandishly different from normal human habitations. Many of the minister's operations invite a comic reaction from himself and others. He uses archaic language, has to pretend ignorance of commonly known facts of life, is forced into ritual acts on occasions when others enjoy conviviality. He must perform sacramental ceremonies that may seem bizarre to his audience if not to himself--throwing water at screaming infants, feeding wafers into mouths open wide under the brim of stylish hats, asking triumphant young American brides whether they will obey their husbands, burning mortgages, and blessing patriotic displays. There are few students of the occupations who will not feel at times that they are engaged in a circus of preposterous nonsense." The Precarious Vision (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 61-2. In fairness to the clergy, it may be said that similar descriptions can be made of other occupations, and Berger does not spare them either.

However, the great success of the evangelical awakening in the revivals which swept the country and which influenced the aforementioned concern for a converted ministry, also had a further consequence. Not only were converted ministers necessary, but better trained ministers were needed who were equipped for the evangelistic and organizational demands which the revival movement created. The apprenticeship system proved inadequate to meet these demands. Better professional training in the practice of ministry was needed. The charter of Princeton Theological Seminary reflects this need:

> So rapid has been the extension of this church and disproportionate of late has been the number of ministers educated to the call which has been made for ministerial service, that some additional efforts to increase the supply are loudly and effectively demanded. Circumstances also do imperiously dictate, not only that the laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be multiplied, but that they should be more thoroughly furnished than they have ordinarily been for the arduous work to which they must be called.

It was not only the revivals that brought about the need for the development of practical skills. A related factor was also significant. Unlike the European situation, American churches, as previously mentioned, were voluntary associations. The separation of church and state, proscribing the establishment of religion, created, in effect, a free market competition among the various denominations and sects for scarce resources, that is, for members. In addition, there was, partly as a result of the frontier experience, a basic pragmatism towards life, a stress on the useful, the practical, and on results. This pragmatism, coupled with the pressures of voluntaristic competition, gave emphasis to the need for training in the techniques of ministry. The authority of the clergyman in America came to rest not only in his status as an educated or pious man, but also on his ability to get things done.[27] As a result, theological schools, following the models provided by law and medicine, which had preceded the churches in establishing separate professional schools, came to emphasize vocational or practical training in ministry along with the more traditional academic interest.

One of the most comprehensive accounts of this development is to be found in Robert L. Kelly's study of Protestant theological education published in 1924.[28] Kelly compared curricula of several representative theological schools at several intervals during the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. While noting the differences between types of schools of different theological traditions (e.g. Reformed, Arminian, and Episcopal), his comparative analysis indicates the trend in all traditions towards the inclusion of an increasing number of required and elective courses in pastoral or practical theology. In the most extreme example, Garrett Biblical Institute, by 1921, more hours in practical theology were required for graduation than in all other fields combined.[29] In various seminaries, supplementing the more traditional "practical" subjects of homiletics and "duties of the pastoral office," as an 1845 course at Harvard was called, were courses in religious education, music, liturgics or public worship; missions, rural and urban church studies, etc. As Kelly notes, it was the seminaries in the Arminian tradition (especially Methodist) that took the lead in experimentation in practical theology:

---

[27] See Littell, op. cit., p. 534; also Mead, op. cit., p. 245 f.

[28] Theological Education in America (New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924), pp. 61-102.

> While the spirit of Reformed Theology has conserved the things of the past, the spirit of Arminianism seems to have been particularly conducive to experimentation. . . . Ventures in new fields for the one group are not easy, whereas to the other they are natural. One seeks finality, the other workability.[30]

In spite of theological differences, however, Kelly's comparative data is richly suggestive of the degree to which the pragmatic,

---

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 68. It should be noted that some of the courses listed as practical theology by Kelly fall more under the rubric of what I shall treat below as an emphasis on secular awareness. Nevertheless, the orientation towards a practically oriented ministry is evident in the titles of all of these courses.

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

voluntaristic situation of the American churches influenced the development of a strongly practical emphasis in various segments of American theological education.

This practical orientation has been much maligned, and perhaps rightly so, to the extent that it has proceeded to some extent in isolation from the traditional theoretically oriented subjects (which may be the fault of the latter disciplines as much as the former). Williams notes that "one major strand in the history of Harvard Divinity School has been the conflict between its integrative (theology) and its professional (practical training) roles."[31] Furthermore, it is probably correct to say that the considerable emphasis on the practical studies for the ministry led to a lowering of academic standards and the development of what has invidiously been called a "trade school" model of theological education. Like the night law schools, there have been seminaries which have been geared to producing practically oriented graduates with a minimum of concern for academic standards.

In the twentieth century, although the debate over the relative importance of practice versus theory continues, the emphasis on practical competence as a part of seminary education has not diminished. The increasing bureaucratization of the churches, creating growing demands for organizational and human relations skills for ministers, has furthered the demand for practical training. As one writer rather sarcastically notes:

---

[31] Williams, (ed.), The Harvard Divinity School, op. cit., p. 6.

> Too often the practical definition of the minister is 'program secretary' or 'director of activities.' The study has become an 'office,' the church is referred to as a 'plant,' and the Gestetner is the most important improvement on the Holy Spirit since Bach.[32]

Samuel Blizzard's research on clergymen points to the increasing time demands which various "practitioner roles" place on the minister, but also his data underscore the lack of normative legitimation given these practitioner roles, partly, I would suggest, due to the traditional bifurcation in seminaries of theory and practice mentioned above.

In recent years, however, much more attention has been given, not only to upgrading considerably the quality of the practical training given--e.g. through the clinical training movement, intern years, and other forms of field education and supervised ministry--but also to attempt to give normative undergirding to these practitioner roles.[33] Nevertheless, both personal observation and experience, as well as the data from this study, indicate that the gap has not been fully bridged.

---

[32] Trotter, op. cit., p. 8.

[33] See Seward Hiltner, "The Teaching of Practical Theology in the United States During the Twentieth Century," The Princeton Seminary Bulletin, LXI (Autumn, 1967), pp. 61-75. Also, see W. Barnett Blakemore, "The Nature and Structure of the Practical Field," Journal of Religion, XXIX (October, 1949), pp. 284-300.

Secular Awareness

Thus far, three historical strands have been discussed as essential to the understanding of contemporary theological education. In addition to mastery of the Christian tradition, personal sanctity or spiritual formation, and practical competence, one further emphasis needs to be considered. It is what I have referred to as the development of secular awareness, and, as a specific concern of theological education, it is of more recent vintage than the three previously mentioned emphases.

By secular awareness is meant the emphasis on assuring that the aspiring clergyman, as a part of his socialization into the profession, become aware of, conversant with, and involved in the culture and social structures in which he will minister as a professional. There are at least two dimensions to this awareness. On the one hand, there is the concern that the seminarian understand the dominant thought forms of his culture, and that he be at home in the dialogue between Christian faith and these various modern thought forms. This, to a considerable extent, reflects the "generalist" nature of the clergy role; that is, while the minister has a body of knowledge for which he is responsible, he is also to a considerable degree expected to have generalized intellectual skills in various areas outside his special body of knowledge. As Reinhold Niebuhr expressed it:

> Here is a task which requires the knowledge of a social scientist and the insight and imagination of a poet, the executive talents of a businessman and the mental discipline of a philosopher. . . . Perhaps that is why people are so

> critical of us. Our task is not specific enough to make a high degree of skill possible or to result in tangible and easily measured results.[34]

On the other hand, the second dimension of secular awareness implies a more activist, prophetic engagement with the culture and society in which the clergyman lives. As such, not only dialogue but also change-oriented action is the aim. It should be said that not all theological educators are agreed on this goal as one for which theological schools should be responsible. As will be mentioned below, some schools are rather negative towards the idea; however, others, while positively affirming the necessity of secular awareness on the part of ministers, do not see this as a legitimate responsibility of the seminary, but rather of the seminarian's undergraduate training.[35]

Disagreement or differences of emphasis notwithstanding, what I have called secular awareness has come to be emphasized as a goal of contemporary theological education.

The roots of secular awareness lie, of course, in the prophetic strand of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. This strand has had an important influence on American Christianity from its earliest beginning.[36] Not only in colonial New England, where there was a "strong sense of the church's direct responsibility for the being and well-being of the commonwealth,"[37] but in the later evangelical movement, which was so dominant a force in American Protestantism in the nineteenth century, there was an intimate relationship between revivalism and social reform. When an evangelical emphasis on perfectionism combined with a milleninarian doctrine of Christ's imminent conquest of the earth, the resultant mixture was socially volatile. Timothy Smith, who has traced in detail this mixture of revivalism and reform, quotes an early nineteenth century evangelical as saying that the task of Christians was

---

[34] Leaves From the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic (New York: Living Age Books, 1929), pp. 201-202. See Dietrich Rueschmayer, "Doctors and Lawyers: A Comment on the Theory of the Professions," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, I (February, 1964), p. 22, for a similar discussion concerning the "generalist" nature of the lawyer's role as compared with that of the physician.

[35] See Martin Marty, "Cultural Education is Pre-Theological," The Making of Ministers, eds. Bridston and Culver, op. cit., pp. 131-156. Also see Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, Pre-Seminary Education, op. cit., pp. 55-87.

> not merely to preach the gospel to every creature, but to recognize human society in accordance with the law of God. To abolish all corruptions in religion and all abuses in the social system and, so far as it has been erected on false principles, to take it down and erect it anew.[38]

The whole period of the nineteenth century, crowned by the rise of the Social Gospel Movement, saw the rise of a number of crusades to Christianize the social order: abolition of slavery, temperance, peace, prison reform, woman's rights, industrial reform, etc. In the twentieth century, chastened by wars and depression, there have been a tempering of optimism over the possibilities of Christianizing the social order and an emphasis on Christian realism concerning society; nevertheless, the concern for dialogue with and engagement in culture and society remains unabated. In recent years, if anything, it has increased, with clergymen, especially, assuming active roles in such concerns as civil rights, poverty programs, the peace movement, etc.[39]

---

[36] See H. Richard Niebuhr, The Kingdom of God in America (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937), pp. 10-11.

[37] Mead, *op. cit.*, p. 225.

[38] Timothy Smith, Revivalism and Social Reform (New York: Harper Torchbook edition, 1965), p. 225.

While it would be an error to suggest that social activism has been the concern of all or perhaps even the majority of clergymen throughout American history, nevertheless, this activist orientation has been one important aspect of ministry for a large number of American clergy. In fact, it might not be too far wrong to wrench a comment made by Alexis de Toqueville out of its 1832 context to supply a generalization concerning the entire strand of social activism among American clergy. Commenting on his encounters with home missionaries, Toqueville remarked, "If you converse with these missionaries of Christian civilization, you will be surprised to hear them speak so often of the goods of this world, and to meet a politician where you expected to find a priest."[40]

---

[39] See John Cogley, "Churchmen Are in the Social Avant Garde," The New York Times, Section E, October 23, 1966, p. 5. A more extended documentation of the prophetic-activist emphasis among clergymen may be found in Jeffrey K. Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1969).

[40] Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, trans. by Henry

To what extent has this social activist emphasis been reflected in theological education? I have suggested that secular awareness, as an explicit goal of theological education, was something of a latecomer to the scene, in comparison with the other emphases, especially the first two emphases which were discussed. To be sure, the early concern that the minister receive a liberal education in the classical tradition was not unrelated to secular awareness. Nevertheless, as an explicit goal of theological education, especially within the formally organized seminaries, the emphasis seems to have been relatively late in receiving specific attention. Indeed, as I suggest above, it is not yet a goal of some theological seminaries at the present.[41] The origin of the seminary in the Roman Catholic tradition stressed, as has been pointed out, the separateness and isolation of the seminary from the "world." The pattern of locating many Protestant seminaries in small communities, separate from a university or urban environment, was also an attempt to protect students from "unwholesome" worldly influences. As Littell has

---

Reeve and revised and edited by Phillips Bradley (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1945), Vol. I, p. 317.

[41] An extreme example of such a school may be seen in the following statement from the catalogue of an avowedly fundamentalist, independent Baptist seminary: "The Seminary stresses the logical necessity for its faculty, staff, and students to live the 'separated life.' Since such practices as the use of alcoholic beverages, card playing, dancing, attendance at theatres, and membership in secret societies are out of harmony with such a life and displeasing to God, they are prohibited to faculty, staff, and students." Los Angeles Baptist Seminary _Catalogue_, 1965, p. 10.

remarked, "With the highest proportion of the Protestant clergy coming from village and farm, the dislocation of many seminaries simply served to blind the seminarians further to the main direction of American thought and social development."[42]

In spite of the anti-urban and anti-university trend in the location of many seminaries, there were some which consciously sought to reverse the trend. For example, in the preamble to the founding of Union Theological Seminary in New York City in 1836, the founders expressed their belief that "large cities furnish many peculiar facilities and advantages for conducting theological education."[43] It is probably not by accident that Union Seminary has had a long tradition of social activist graduates and faculty.

When secular awareness became an explicit goal of theological education is difficult to determine. The exact period varies from seminary to seminary. Nevertheless, the curricula analysis by Kelly[44] provides some clues. While the evangelical emphasis on social reform preceded the introduction of courses relating to this emphasis into theological curricula by a number of years, by 1895, Kelly noted the inclusion of courses in Christian sociology, psychology of religion, missions, history of religions, the "Harmony of Science and Revelation," and other such courses dealing with the relationship between the church and society and between faith and modern thought. Kelly's comment regarding the school of theology at Oberlin is applicable more generally to a number of seminaries of the day: "The program of study was changing from the dogmatic to the practical, from the ecclesio-centric to the socio-centric, and from service of self to the service of the community.[45] More than any other factor, it was the Social Gospel movement, as a response to the profound changes in American society brought about by urbanization, industrialization and immigration, that was responsible for this shift in curriculum. As Robert S. Michaelsen has said of the impact of the Social Gospel movement on theological education:

---

[42] Littell, _op_. _cit_., p. 545.

[43] Union Seminary _Catalogue_, 1966-67, p. 26.

[44] _Op_. _cit_., pp. 61-102.

> In the minds of many a successful ministry now entailed a study of society and of the social forces involved in shaping the life of the individual, an awareness of social evils as well as personal sins, and some knowledge of the means of 'social salvation' as well as of individual redemption. The minister was to identify himself with an advancing Kingdom of God which reached far beyond the confines of the church; he was to engage in service to the community as a whole and not to the church alone. . . . In some way he was to become _the_ minister of the great social order which was developing.[46]

As I have already pointed out, such an idealized image of the minister's role in society was to be profoundly tempered by the events of the twentieth century. In response to these events, neo-orthodox theology brought a realism to social action that was to some extent lacking in the Social Gospel emphasis. Yet, theological education--or at least a considerable portion of it--has retained and extended the concern for secular awareness as one aspect of its goal. Courses in social ethics, sociology, Christianity and culture, continue to be offered, and, in addition, the concept of field education has been extended to include supervised participation in a variety of non-church settings. Therefore, although to some extent a latecomer to the scene, what I have called secular awareness must be taken into account as an important historical strand which has been woven into the fabric of contemporary theological education. To the concern for a ministry intellectually grounded in the Christian tradition, with a developing and maturing sanctity, and competent in the practice of the profession, must be added the concern that the minister be understanding of and involved in the culture and society of which he is a member.

---

[45] _Ibid._, p. 76. One seminary is reported to have gone so far as to establish an agricultural experimental station for the training of rural pastors. _Ibid._, p. 100.

[46] "The Protestant Ministry in America: 1850 to the Present," _op_. _cit_., p. 261.

II. MODELS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Given the four goals of theological education, one might be led to say that the ideal model of theological education would be one in which the four goals were carefully integrated so that each of them received its proper and necessary emphasis and contributed to the others. Ronald F. Ward, reflecting the first three of the four goals mentioned above, expresses this need for balance quite well:

> . . . we may observe that a theological college partakes of the nature of a university, of a church, and of a school of vocational training. It is like a university in that it is engaged in the pursuit of knowledge: its interests are intellectual, its disciplines are academic, its work teaching, and, to some extent, research. It resembles a church, for its members belong to the People of God, they love him, they serve him, and it is by his will that they are in college at all. It is like a school of vocational training, for we know what the students are going to be--ministers. . . .
>
> This balance between university, church, and vocational school must be maintained. If we emphasize exclusively the university side, we may produce a race of theorists, stuffed with knowledge, but unable to minister to the saints. . . . If we dwell too much on the aspect of the church, we forget that the college is not merely a place for devotional growth--though it is that. . . . And if we think only of the future ministry, our men will leave college confirmed in an unlearned, impious procrastination.[47]

Were the fourth goal--secular awareness--added to this statement, it would perhaps provide a fitting statement concerning proper balance in achieving the overall aim of theological education.

Unfortunately, however, the kind of equilibrium implied is difficult to imagine and even more difficult to maintain. As has been previously noted, there is, apparently, no one formula for attaining the "proper and necessary" balance of the goals of theological education. And even if there were such a formula, it would of necessity be variable, since the "proper" balance depends to a considerable extent on the socio-cultural context of theological education in differing periods of history. The preceding historical sketches have pointed up the interaction of the socio-cultural milieu and the predominant emphasis of theological education in various periods of history. What is more accurate to say, therefore, is that at different times, or within different denominational traditions, the four goals of theological education (or sometimes fewer than four) have received differing degrees of emphasis.

---

[47] Ronald L. Ward, "The Relevance of Ministerial Training," Religion in Life, XXV (Winter, 1955-56), pp. 56-7.

Logically, as was suggested in Chapter One, there are twenty four possible combinations of the four goals according to the relative importance assigned to each. I suggested, however, that it makes neither methodological nor historical sense to consider as many varieties as are logically possible. For this reason, I indicated that, for the purposes of this study, I would consider only four types.

These four types are derived by treating the four goals, which have been considered in the preceding section, as if they represented two dichotomies: (1) Mastery of the Tradition versus Practical Competence; and (2) Spiritual Formation versus Secular Awareness. It is actually considerably more accurate to consider these pairs, not as dichotomies, but rather as polar points on two underlying continua. Only for the sake of simplicity (of discussion and measurement) are they treated here as if they were dichotomous distinctions.

Anyone who is familiar with theological education will recognize that these two dichotomies represent major points of contention which have long plagued theological educators and students.[48] As James Gustafson has said of the theory versus practice distinction, it is "a hoary issue if there ever was one,"[49] and this is equally true of the spiritual-secular distinction. While it can be argued normatively and practically that these are, in last analysis, false and misleading distinctions,[50] the distinctions are recognized, nevertheless, as real ones, and they tend to affect various aspects of seminary organization. The latter dichotomy, as has been mentioned, has in times past affected even the geographical location of seminaries. That is, where a denominational group defined spiritual formation as basic in opposition to secular awareness, they often located seminaries in isolated communities "to avoid contamination with the city or the university."[51] The other dichotomy--theory versus practice--has also had a variety of organizational consequences, ranging from determining the structure of the curriculum to influencing the status system of the faculty; e.g., other things being equal, members of the "practical" departments frequently have lower status in the eyes of students than do those in the "theoretical" fields. This, however, is variable.

---

[48] The first of the two distinctions, which in essence is a theory versus practice distinction, is obviously not restricted to theological schools, but is a recurring theme in many discussions of education for a variety of professions.

[49] Gustafson, "Theological Education as Professional Education," op. cit., p. 246.

[50] See the very helpful discussion of this in Walter L. Holcomb and John L. Maes, "Functional Roles, Professional Identity, and Theological Curricula," Theological Education, II (Spring, 1966), p. 193. The authors discuss the necessity for overcoming three dichotomies in the curricula: (1) classical versus practical elements; (2) the seminary versus the real world; and (3) religious versus other life experiences of the student.

[51] Trotter, op. cit., p. 7.

Given the empirical existence and the practical consequences of these two dichotomies, I propose to use them to reduce the number of potential types of theological schools. By treating the goals as dichotomies, and by cross-classifying them, four broad types of schools are possible: (1) one which places major emphasis upon Mastery of the Tradition and Spiritual Formation; (2) one which emphasizes Practical Competence and Spiritual Formation; (3) one which emphasizes Mastery of the Tradition and Secular Awareness; and (4) one which places major emphasis upon Practical Competence and Secular Awareness (See Figure I above). It should be stressed that no one of the types, which are based on the dominance of two of the four goals, necessarily excludes the other two goals. The classification implies only that the remaining two goals do not receive dominant emphasis. Thus the combination of practical competence with spiritual formation does not eliminate the possibility that mastery of the tradition and secular awareness are also emphasized. They are simply not the dominant emphases. This important point should be kept in mind, since the use of the dichotomous pairs rather than continua tends to obscure it.

In light of the historical analysis in the preceding section, is there any justification for considering these four combinations as having historical validity? Before suggesting that there appears to be some historical validity to the types, it is important to repeat what was said in Chapter One. The attempt to link the empirically derived types of this study with historical ones may be somewhat arbitrary, and, in last analysis, it is not crucial for their predictive validity that the empirical types be isomorphic with historical types. That is, the major concern is to define types of schools in such a way that it is possible to predict their association with various socialization outcomes. If, however, there is some historical validity to the typology, then the interpretation of the findings is greatly enhanced.

With regard to the historical analysis above, I would suggest that the combination of Mastery of the Tradition and Spiritual Formation as dominant emphases has some affinity with what, from a historical perspective, might be called the "Religious Community" model. In this model, as Thomas Trotter suggests, "the student is separated from the world so that the world's temptations will not intrude to disrupt the calm surface of study and prayer."[52] Clearly its antecedents are in the Roman Catholic Tridentine seminarium, but they are also in the more conservative elements of the Lutheran and Reformed traditions, who have given strong emphasis to the preaching and teaching of the Word within the gathered community (rather than the "world"). While none of the seminaries in this study reflects the Religious Community model in an extreme form, it seems justifiable to consider this goal combination as to some extent reflecting this historic type.

---

[52] Ibid., p. 8.

The second emphasis, combining Practical Competence and Spiritual Formation, has affinity with what has been called the "Vocational School" model or, more invidiously, the "Trade School." In light of the historical analysis in the preceding section, this model would appear to be peculiarly American. That is, it has grown out of the American voluntaristic, pragmatic and revivalist ethos in religion. As a result, the emphasis is on practical skills and competence, combined with a concern for the spiritual authority of the minister as a "man of God."[53] Both emphases have been predominantly oriented towards preparing ministers to function in congregations whose members tend to value practical competence and personal piety more highly than intellectual or prophetic-activist proclivities.[54]

The third type, which reflects the combination of Mastery of the Tradition and Secular Awareness as dominant emphases, suggests affinities with what has been called the Graduate School or Theological University model. This model represents the convergence of two emphases in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. On the one hand, there is the previously cited influence of faculty trained in the research-oriented German universities, with their stress on theological scholarship in relative isolation from the concerns of the institutional churches.[55] On the other hand, there was the more or less concomitant impact of the Social Gospel movement in America. The European emphasis on theological scholarship in relative isolation from, or perhaps, better, in critical tension with, the institutional church converged with the emphasis on engagement with secular thought forms and transformation of secular institutions. It was especially, although not exclusively, the university schools of theology in which this model emerged.[56]

---

[53] See H. Richard Niebuhr, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson, The Advancement of Theological Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), pp. 3-4, for a discussion of the circumstances that led to this union of piety and practicality in theological education.

[54] For a fuller description of this Vocational School model, see Trotter, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

The fourth combination of goals, Practical Competence and Secular Awareness, presents peculiar problems, not least of which is the circumstance alluded to in Chapter One. In the analysis of the data for this study, this type failed to emerge as a clear-cut emphasis. This anomaly could be the result of sampling error, or it could be the result of inadequate measurement. While these possibilities cannot be discounted, there is another circumstance which makes these explanations at least subject to question. The literature on theological education in general deals only with the three types of schools which have already been considered.[57] There is a hint of a model with this particular combination of goal emphases in Kelly's characterization of Methodist seminary curricula;[58] however, since Kelly was dealing only with curricula matters, it may be that an emphasis upon spiritual formation (in the evangelical sense) was obscured. Whatever the reason, this type is infrequently mentioned and did not appear empirically. It may be, as I will suggest in the concluding chapter, that this goal combination has some affinity with an emerging new model of theological education which is not reflected in this study.

---

[55] See above, p. 57f.

[56] See Kelly, op. cit., pp. 103-105, 131-134, for examples of the curricula of schools combining these two emphases, and the particular importance of some of the major university schools.

Thus, there are three, rather than four, models of theological education which emerged empirically and which, to some extent, have affinities with the three historic models. These three--the Religious Community, the Vocational School, and the Graduate School--will be the focus of what follows. These models, it should be clear, are another way of expressing what, in the last chapter, were called "social climates" of theological schools. That is, social climates were conceptualized as embodying the goals of theological education as held by the members of the schools, just as the models described above were derived from varying combinations of the four goals. The concern now is to test the hypotheses, previously stated, regarding the relation of these three models or social climates of theological education to theological orientations, social-ethical perspectives, and images of ministry. In the following three chapters, the sample and research design are discussed and certain correlates of the respondents and of the types of theological schools are considered. The remaining chapters will be devoted to reporting the tests of the major hypotheses.

---

[57] E.g., Trotter, op. cit., pp. 7-8; also Ward, op. cit., p. 57, alludes only to three models: the university, the church, and the vocational school.

[58] "A certain homogeneity of programs of the six Methodist Episcopal seminaries is noticeable. They lay comparatively little stress upon the historical aspect of theological education and put much upon later developments in the field of religious education and social service." Kelly, op. cit., p. 97.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH PROCEDURES: DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

In Chapter One, a brief overview of the entire design of the study was given. The choice of the major dependent and independent variables to be analyzed was discussed, and the central hypotheses were stated. It will be recalled that the major dependent variables represent belief and attitudinal variables which are hypothesized to have been influenced by theological schools as agencies of socialization. These variables include theological orientations, social-ethical perspectives, and images of ministry. Scales which measure these variables and others related to them have been constructed out of responses to questions in the two survey instruments used to gather data. The content and construction of these scales can be more meaningfully discussed in the context of subsequent chapters in which tests of hypotheses concerning the dependent variables are reported.

The major independent variable--the social climates or models of theological schools--has also been discussed at some length, not only in Chapter One, but in the two subsequent chapters as well. Because the concept is central to the study and relates to each of the chapters dealing with the various socialization outcomes, a considerable portion of this chapter will be devoted to problems of design and analysis that have particular reference to social climates.

First, however, several comments regarding the natural history of the research and a discussion of methods of data collection are in order to provide a general frame of reference.

I. THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE RESEARCH

In an idealized theory-data cycle in sociological research, one formulates his theory, designs his research so that his theoretical constructs are translated into valid and reliable empirical indicators, and then selects a population or a sample in which to put his theory to test. This idealized sequence is an example of the "dog wagging the tail" in proper fashion. However, there are times in research when the "tail wags the dog," or, at least, when some mutual accommodation has to be made between the two ends of the beast. The latter situation is clearly the case in this study, as it probably is in much sociological research. Therefore, it is difficult to discuss considerations of the design and mode of analysis to test the hypotheses previously stated without reflecting at the same time on the ways in which sampling matters affected these considerations.

The major problem with which the study is concerned--how differences in seminary organization, reflected in models or social climates of the schools, influence socialization into the profession--has been made clear in the preceding chapters. When the problem first was considered for research, the ideal plan seemed to be the careful selection of several seminaries which, from limited knowledge, would conceivably represent the different models of theological schools. Case studies, using comparable research instruments, would be undertaken in each school. Both observation and formalized interview schedules would be used.

For a number of reasons, including time and cost factors, this plan did not materialize. Probably the major reason for altering the plans, however, was the generous offer of Dr. Jeffrey Hadden to allow me to use the data gathered in connection with the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries for a secondary analysis. The sample and design of the Danforth study will be considered in the next section (also, see Appendix B); however, the point at issue at present is the effect which this possibility had on the design of the study.

The Danforth study offered a wealth of data on the beliefs and attitudes of a large, carefully drawn national sample of Protestant campus and parish clergymen, a sizable portion of whom were fairly recent graduates of seminaries across the nation. In terms of time and cost savings alone, the offer to use the Danforth data was appealing, but the scope and quality of the data made the offer even more attractive (see Appendix A regarding the Danforth questionnaire). Therefore, the decision to use the study was readily made.

Such a decision, however, was not without its problems in relation to the central concerns of the research. The "tail began to wag the dog." For one thing, the Danforth sample was not drawn on the basis of seminary attended, but constituted a random sample of ministers of six Protestant denominations. Thus, the respondents in the study do not represent a random sample of graduates of the seminaries considered in the study; rather, they represent a random sample of ministers of each of the six denominations who happen to be graduates of the seminaries included. Members of other denominations not included in the study, who are graduates of these seminaries, are not represented in the sample. Since most of the seminaries are considerably homogeneous denominationally, this limitation is not, I believe, a serious one.

A second factor is also related to the sample. Since the sample was drawn from the total universe of ministers of each of the six denominations, the age range of the ministers, and, hence, the years of graduation from seminary, were quite broad. The practical implication of this was that, in spite of the large N (number of respondents) of the Danforth study, it proved impossible to select out for analysis only those who were in attendance at the various seminaries during the same time period. The N for individual seminaries was not, in most cases, large enough to allow such selectivity. Rather, a compromise had to be made by selecting men in a specified age range (45 years or younger), which meant that each seminary was represented by graduates over a time period of approximately fifteen years. As will be indicated below, compensation was made for this age variation, but it would have been more desirable to have had a homogeneous group with regard to years of attendance at the seminary.

A third and quite important factor which influenced the design of the research was the fact that the Danforth study was not basically concerned with the seminary experience of the ministers. Indeed, the primary seminary-related questions in the survey instrument were those which asked about the seminary attended and the year of graduation. It soon became apparent that, if the theoretical purposes of the research were to be served, then supplementary data would be necessary. Thus, a decision was made to conduct a follow-up survey with a mailed questionnaire (see Appendix A) to gather data regarding aspects of the seminary experience of the ministers.

This leads to a fourth problem. Initially, as indicated above, observation and interviewing of current seminarians were anticipated as data sources; however, the use of the Danforth data and the supplementary follow-up questionnaire necessitated asking the respondents to recall their past seminary experiences. The use of data based on recall--for some respondents as much as fifteen years--is less than ideal to say the least. To what extent this problem distorted the findings is not known. One bit of assurance that the data are reasonably reliable is that a considerable number of respondents wrote in the margins or at the end of their questionnaires that the attitudes they reported as having held in seminary were definitely not their current attitudes. Also, most of the aggregated findings based on recall were in line with expectations and assumptions which I and others held about the seminaries.

Finally, the decision to use the Danforth survey data, while allowing a large number of seminaries to be considered (twenty-one were selected), changed the initial plan for field observation and interviews. It was simply not feasible, financially or temporally, to visit the twenty-one seminaries. Rather the survey data (from the follow-up), plus considerable personal experience in three of the institutions in the sample, and reasonably adequate knowledge of others, had to suffice. However, a major concern of the study, as indicated in the preceding chapters, is with structural aspects of the seminaries, for which survey data are not always ideally suited. To overcome the limitations imposed by survey data in answering questions of a structural nature constituted, therefore, a major design problem.

It is obvious, then, that the theory-data cycle of this research, flowed not in any neatly linear fashion, but constituted a rather complex "feed-back loop," to use a metaphor from communications theory. This, I suspect, is the rule rather than the exception in research; however, the particular decisions necessitated by the data used for this research created peculiar problems which needed to be spelled out clearly.

II. METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

The preceding section has included several references to the data used for this study. Because of the somewhat atypical situation which data collection posed for research design, it will be helpful, perhaps, to provide a brief description of data collection procedures at this point. The interested reader may consult Appendix B for a more detailed discussion of these matters. Also, the design and sampling procedures for the aforementioned Danforth Study of Campus Ministries have been described elsewhere at some length by Jeffrey K. Hadden.[1]

The Danforth study consisted of a rather long--approximately 524 questions--questionnaire that was mailed to approximately 12,000 Protestant parish and campus ministers early in 1965. These ministers represented six denominations--American Baptist, American Lutheran (ALC), Episcopal, Methodist, Missouri Synod Lutheran (MSL), and United Presbyterian (UPUSA). The mailing went to a 25% random probability sample of the parish ministers and to the total population of campus ministers in the six denominations. A return of 67% usable questionnaires was received.

As was previously indicated, it was deemed necessary to send a follow-up questionnaire, since the Danforth study was not primarily concerned with the question of socialization nor with the minister's theological education. Therefore, a sub-sample of the respondents to the Danforth study was selected for the follow-up. This sample provided the basic data for the analysis that is reported here. First, twenty-one seminaries were selected for inclusion in the analysis. Two criteria were used: (1) an attempt was made to select a representative group of seminaries on the basis of denominational affiliation, size, location, reputation, and institutional affiliation (i.e., whether related to a college or university or not); and (2) the pragmatic criterion of whether or not the seminary had a sufficient number of respondents in the Danforth study to be considered a representative group for analysis. In addition, the age criterion mentioned previously was used in selecting the sample. Only those men who were under 45 years of age, who had attended one of the twenty-one seminaries, were included. The purpose for this restriction was to use as recent graduates as possible while maintaining a sufficiently large N (number of respondents) to make analysis feasible.

---

[1] "A Study of the Protestant Ministry of America," Journal For the Scientific Study of Religion, V (No. 1, 1965), pp. 10-23. Also see Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches, pp. 37-38. The latter volume is based in part on the data from the national survey of parish ministers.

Using these criteria, 2,396 respondents were selected for the follow-up survey. Of this number, current addresses could be secured for 2,242, and these were mailed follow-up questionnaires in early April, 1968. Fifteen hundred and eighty-four usable responses were returned by mid-June, when data analysis was begun. This number represents 70.4% of the actual questionnaires mailed, or 66.1% of the total selected, including those for whom no addresses could be found.

Although the original Danforth study was based on a random sample, all that can be asserted with any certainty about the follow-up sample, as was mentioned above, is that it is a random sample of those men from the six denominations who were students in the twenty-one seminaries during the period which their years of graduation represent. They do not constitute a random sample of all the graduates of the seminaries during the period covered. The attrition of cases due to non-response or lack of current mailing address, plus the above mentioned problem of asking the respondents to recall previous attitudes and behavior, also create potential bias or error. In Appendix B, the respondents in the follow-up sample are compared on several measures with the original total body of respondents to the Danforth Study. When the age of the Danforth respondents is controlled to compare with the age of the follow-up respondents, there does not appear to be serious bias. Nevertheless, there is no way of knowing how much or how little bias exists with reference to the specific seminaries represented; therefore, extreme caution should be exercised in generalizing from the findings to all graduates of the seminaries which were selected. Lest this sound too negative and restrictive regarding the sample and findings, it seems appropriate to cite at length a point made by Hans Zetterberg which is relevant to the problems being considered:

> The relationships expressed in theoretical propositions . . . claim to be universally present. They are, accordingly, present both in representative and non-representative samples. To disprove their existence is, hence, possible in any kind of sample--biased or unbiased. This important, and perhaps

> surprising, consideration, however, should immediately be qualified. When using a biased sample for verification, we must have assurance that the relationship we want to prove is not introduced into our data by selective sampling. This possibility, however, is in most cases rather unlikely. Also, when using a biased sample for verification, we should realize that we have no knowledge of the population to which the result can be safely generalized. . . . On balance, it appears that non-representative samples are not much inferior to representative samples when we want to disprove a theoretical hypothesis.[2]

It should be mentioned that Zetterberg warns that non-representative samples are a serious problem for descriptive studies. Some aspects of the data analysis to follow will be on the descriptive level; e.g., that in the following two chapters. In these chapters, one can only assert a belief that the sample is reasonably representative. The majority of the data analysis, however, concerns a testing of the theoretical propositions previously stated, and Zetterberg's statement constitutes a "word of permission" to proceed with some confidence.

III. THE MEASUREMENT OF SOCIAL CLIMATES--
A STRUCTURAL EFFECTS DESIGN

Having given attention to the natural history of the research, which entailed some decisions which were quite influential on matters of design, and having briefly described the methods of data collection, I return now to a major problem of design, that of the measurement and analysis of social climates of theological schools. Since it is so central to the entire research, it will be the focus of the remainder of this chapter.

---

[2] On Theory and Verification in Sociology (Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1963), pp. 54-55.

The concept of social climate, it will be recalled from the discussion in Chapter Two, is being used to refer to the ranking of the goals of theological seminaries into various hierarchies of desired socialization outcomes (which, it is inferred, correspond to historic models of theological education). More accurately, social climate is used to refer to the preferences for certain goals (or hierarchies of goals) which are shared by a major proportion of the members of the organization and which, to some extent, constitute the ethos of the organization. As such, the social climate of a seminary or other organization is, as Wheeler indicates, "a subjective and attitudinal set rather than a condition effectively known by studying interaction patterns or personal characteristics."[3] How then to design a study so as to measure something so subtle and subjective, especially when data collection is via a mailed questionnaire survey?

Although one would optimally prefer to gather data on social climates in conjunction with field observation in each of the schools, the mail survey is not so inadequate for this purpose as it might seem. It is true that survey data are primarily data regarding the attitudes and behavior of individuals rather than of aspects of social structure, such as the social climate. To use the terminology developed by Kendall and Lazarsfeld,[4] the survey method yields a "personal datum," whereas social climate refers to a "unit datum." However, as these authors show, while a unit datum can be a property of a group which is derived from some aspect of the group itself and not from the individuals in the group, unit data can also be meaningfully derived from aggregated personal data, through the use of rates, averages, or parameters of the distribution of a variable.[5]

---

[3] Wheeler, op. cit., p. 82.

The important and interesting aspect of personal and unit data (both of which stem initially from the same measure) is that they do not necessarily have the same meaning or the same relationship to a third set of data. Thus we may measure the attitudes which individuals have towards some object. This yields personal data about the individuals in the sample. However, suppose the sample included individuals in several clearly identifiable groups, such as school student bodies. We might then aggregate the personal data for each school and use the resulting rate, average, or other parameter as a unit datum of the school as a whole. The unit datum would tell us something about the social structure or context of the school of which the individual is a member, and the structure of one school might then be compared with that of another.

---

[4] Patricia L. Kendall and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "The Relationship Between Individual and Group Characteristics in 'The American Soldier,'" The Language of Social Research, Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg, editors, (New York: The Free Press, 1955), pp. 290-296. See also the more recent article by Hanan C. Selvin and Warren O. Hagstrom, "The Empirical Classification of Formal Groups," College Peer Groups, op. cit., pp. 162-189.

[5] Ibid., pp. 292-293.

Furthermore, the individual measures might reveal that two individuals, each in a different school, have identical attitudes on some matter. However, the aggregate measure for the school in which the first individual is a student might be considerably different from the aggregate measure of the school in which the second individual is a student. They hold similar attitudes but within differing social structures or contexts. The interesting question, then, is whether or not these individuals will behave similarly or differently in a situation in which the attitude that they share in common is supposed to affect? That is, will the difference in structure or context influence their behavior independently of the shared individual attitudes, even when the contextual measures are derived from an aggregating of the individual measure? If the answer is affirmative, then, other things being equal, we will have demonstrated what were referred to in Chapter Two as "structural effects," following Peter Blau.[6] That is, we will have demonstrated that, in addition to the influence which an individual's internalized attitudes obviously have on his behavior, the prevalence of social attitudes within a group also exerts constraints on behavior which are independent of the influence of his own internalized attitudes. To adapt an illustration from Blau to fit the school example above, if our two students both held non-discriminatory attitudes towards minorities, but the aggregate measures on discriminatory attitudes for the two schools differed--one in an anti-discriminatory and the other in a pro-discriminatory direction--then we would expect to find a difference in overt discriminatory behavior in the two students. The one in the pro-discriminatory context would be more likely to discriminate than the other, even though they held similar non-discriminatory attitudes. However, the former student, as a result of his *individual* attitudes, would be likely to be less discriminatory than a fellow student in the same school who shared the dominant attitude favoring discrimination. Thus individual and structural effects are both operative, and neither can be overlooked. The major concern here, however, is with structural effects.

---

[6] Blau, "Structural Effects," pp. 179-193. Others have referred to this phenomenon as "compositional effects"; however, although the nomenclature and techniques of analysis suggested vary slightly, the idea is essentially similar. See James A. Davis, Joe L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson, "A Technique For Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition," American Sociological Review, XXVI (April, 1961), pp. 215-225. A criticism of the techniques of analysis, but not of the substance of Blau and Davis, et al.'s work on structural or compositional effects has been made by Arnold S. Tannenbaum and Jerald G. Bachman, "Structural Versus Individual

The rather simple technique of analysis which Blau proposes is the one which will be used in this study. In essence it involves first measuring individuals on some attribute or variable "a_1" and

---

Effects," *Control in Organization*, ed. Arnold Tannenbaum (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968), pp. 185-197.

then characterizing these individuals as being either "a" or "non-a." Next, one characterizes the groups to which the individuals belong by aggregating the above personal data. The groups are classified as "A" or "Non-A." By holding constant the group characteristics, one examines the relation of the individual characteristics to some third datum as is illustrated in Figure 2. First, one compares the within-groups differences which exist between the "a's" and "non-a's" in Group "A." This is repeated for the individuals in Group "Non-A." Secondly, one compares the various between-groups differences that exist between the individuals in Groups "A" and "Non-A." These various comparisons will enable one to determine the operation both of structural and individual effects. While other techniques for analysis of structural effects have been suggested,[7] the data of this study lend themselves best to this rather simple and straightforward technique suggested by Blau.

Group "A"		Group "Non-A"	
Individuals "a"	Individuals "non-a"	Individuals "a"	Individuals "non-a"
Highs Lows	Highs Lows	Highs Lows	Highs Lows

FIGURE 2

DUMMY STRUCTURAL EFFECTS TABLE

---

[7] See Davis, Spaeth and Huson, loc. cit.; Tannenbaum and Bachmann, loc. cit.; Selvin and Hagstrom, loc. cit.; and Alan B. Wilson, "A Comparison of Three Modes of Analysis of Survey Data" (unpublished paper, Berkeley, California, no date).

This somewhat general discussion of the meaning, measurement and analysis of structural effects was in answer to the question posed near the beginning of this section as to how one measures social climates, especially with a mail survey approach. One answer--the one chosen in this research--lies, therefore, in the use of a structural effects method of design and analysis. The process followed can now be briefly outlined in light of the preceding discussion.

Since social climates have been conceptualized as the more or less shared rankings of the goals of theological education which constitute the ethos of a school, the first step was to conceptualize the four goals of theological education--Mastery of the Tradition, Spiritual Formation, Practical Competence, and Secular Awareness--in such a way that they could be measured through the survey. The overall meaning of those goals should be clear following the discussion of them in the preceding chapter. For research purposes, however, a decision had to be made as to a valid and reliable means of measuring these goals. The one chosen--after considering and trying several other possibilities--was suggested by Richard E. Peterson in a study of college students,[8] with some further modifications. It consisted quite simply of four brief statements meant to communicate the crux of each of the four goals of theological education in a quickly understandable manner (see page 3 of the follow-up questionnaire in Appendix A). After reading through the statements which were referred to as "perspectives on theological education," respondents were requested to "think back to your own views during seminary" and to rank the perspectives according to the order that best describes "your orientation to theological education while you were in seminary." Each perspective was to receive a rank of 1, 2, 3, or 4. Respondents were also asked to think of their five closest friends during seminary and to attempt to rank their perspectives. Furthermore, they were asked to do the same for the faculty whom they most admired. It is the personal perspectives, however, that are the major concern at present, for it was from personal perspectives that the measure of social climates was eventually constructed. Table 1 gives the distribution of the ranking of each perspective.

---

[8] "On a Typology of College Students," (Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, March, 1965), pp. 7-13.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTIONS (BY PERCENTAGES) FOR THE RANKINGS GIVEN TO THE FOUR GOALS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION*

GOALS	RANKS 1	2	3	4	No Answer	Total %
Mastery of the Tradition	55.0	24.1	10.8	5.4	4.8	100.0
Practical Competence	30.6	35.0	20.8	7.9	5.6	100.0
Spiritual Formation	7.9	17.9	40.3	25.6	7.8	100.0
Secular Awareness	5.0	14.2	19.8	52.7	8.2	100.0

*Percentages in this and other tables do not always total 100% due to rounding.

Once the perspectives were ranked, then it became necessary to assign each respondent a score according to the way in which he ranked the goals. On the basis of the assumptions discussed earlier regarding considering the four goals as pairs of dichotomies, each respondent was assigned a score on the basis of which goal in each pair he ranked highest. Thus, he could be classified as Tradition/Spiritual, Practical/Spiritual, Tradition/Secular, or Practical/Secular.[9] This became what has been referred to as his personal philosophy of theological education.

But, following the logic of a structural effects design, this personal datum (or index)--the respondent's philosophy of theological education--had to be transformed into an aggregate or unit datum for each seminary. Table 2 reveals how this was accomplished.[10] Quite simply, it was done by cross-tabulating the personal philosophies by the seminary attended. This gave a distribution for each seminary of the number and percentage of graduates holding each of the four

---

[9] There are other possibilities for measuring and scoring goals. If I were to repeat the study at some later date, I would develop scales for each of the four goals, scoring them according to the method suggested by Sister Marie Augusta Neal, S.N.D., Values and Interests in Social Change, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), pp. 52-3. While the present method has proved adequate, the use of multiple items for each goal has the advantage of greater likelihood of clarity and of more discrimination between respondents. See also Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review, XXXIII (August, 1968), pp. 518-544, for another method of measuring goals of educational institutions.

[10] It will be noticed that individual seminaries are not identified by name in Table 2. The purpose of the research is not

TABLE 2

RANKING OF GOALS OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION (PERCENTAGE) BY SEMINARIES AND YEAR OF GRADUATION

RANKINGS OF GOALS	Baptist	Baptist	Baptist	Baptist	ALC	ALC	ALC	Episcopal	Episcopal	Episcopal	Episcopal	Methodist	Methodist	Methodist	MSL	Presbyt.	Presbyt.	Presbyt.	Interdenom.	Interdenom.	Interdenom.
										BEFORE 1958											
	N = 756																				
TRADITION/ SPIRITUAL	14	18	67	33	53	56	55	62	35	19	28	42	23	40	67	19	50	39	29	37	56
PRACTICAL/ SPIRITUAL	14	27	29	67	34	25	36	21	20	42	35	16	44	14	19	21	30	50	7	7	44
TRADITION/ SECULAR	57	27	5	-	13	13	6	10	45	21	20	32	16	23	7	40	15	4	42	44	-
PRACTICAL/ SECULAR	14	27	-	-	-	6	3	7	-	19	17	10	18	23	8	19	5	8	23	11	-
										1958 AND AFTER											
	N = 695																				
TRADITION/ SPIRITUAL	25	22	46	70	52	58	32	66	29	37	24	20	21	31	57	12	28	13	35	25	40
PRACTICAL/ SPIRITUAL	25	11	27	30	36	16	30	14	24	40	15	17	44	24	21	3	23	13	-	10	40
TRADITION/ SECULAR	-	56	0	-	9	18	19	10	41	10	42	47	19	22	10	67	32	48	58	55	20
PRACTICAL/ SECULAR	50	11	18	-	3	8	19	10	6	13	20	17	17	24	13	18	17	26	8	10	-

personal philosophies. The modal philosophy for each seminary was taken to be the social climate for that seminary; however, as can be seen from an inspection of the table, some seminaries have rather "weak" social climates in that the modal category is not considerably larger than one or more of the others. A few distributions were bi-modal, as will be considered further below.

A further refinement was made to account for the differences in year of graduation among the respondents. Since theological education is not static but dynamic, it was expected that changes would occur over time in the modal ordering of goals. To take this into account, respondents were grouped into two cohorts by year of graduation. The year 1958 was selected as a dividing point for several reasons. Pragmatically, it gave a rather even division of the sample into two cohorts. Substantively, however, the general time period around 1958 was important as a period of considerable ferment in theological education. The Carnegie Foundation report of the study of theological education had been published in 1957.[11] The research of Samuel W. Blizzard regarding role problems of Protestant parish ministers and the implications for theological education was also attracting considerable attention.[12] This, too,

---

to consider individual seminaries but rather types of seminaries according to their social climates.

[11] Niebuhr, Williams and Gustafson, The Advancement of Theological Education.

[12] See, for example, Blizzard, "The Minister's Dilemma";

was a time when the rosy blush of the so-called religious revival of the 1950's was well on its way towards fading, and it is probably safe to say that the recognition of this had some effect on seminary education. For these several reasons, then, the year 1958 was chosen as a fitting dividing point.

After cross tabulation was accomplished, controlling for year of graduation, it was possible to group seminaries according to the modal philosophy of their graduates, which, as was indicated previously, was taken to be the seminary's social climate.[13] The three models of theological education--the Religious Community, the Vocational School, and the Graduate School--are identifiable. As previously noted, the fourth logical possibility, the combination of Practical Competence and Secular Awareness, failed to appear save for one seminary during one time period. That type (including the graduates during this time period) is not considered in the analysis

---

"The Protestant Minister's Integrating Roles," Religious Education, 53 (July-August, 1958), pp. 374-80; "The Parish Minister's Self-Image and His Master Role," Pastoral Psychology, 9 (December 1958), pp. 25-32; "The Roles of the Rural Parish Minister, the Protestant Seminaries, and the Sciences of Social Behavior," Religious Education, 50 (November-December, 1955), pp. 383-392.

[13] Changes over the two time periods were taken into account. If the modal philosophy was, for example, Type A during the first time period, respondents in that time period were grouped with other Type A's. However, if the modal climate changed to a Type B for the second time period, that change was accounted for in the grouping. Also, seminaries with ties in modal categories, were omitted from analysis during the time period when the tie occurred. Finally, graduates from the one "deviant case," the first Baptist seminary in Table 2, for the second time period, were eliminated from analysis.

(see footnote 13). The grouping means that, in the structural effects analysis to follow, I will not be examining the structural effects of the social climate of an individual seminary; rather, the structural effects of types of social climates (or models of theological education) will be the concern.

It will be noticed that by grouping seminaries together according to social climates, a combination is made of students from different seminaries. The groups then become analytic rather than concrete groups in which there is social intercourse among the members. While this constituted another decision necessitated by the nature of the data that is less than desirable, I would suggest that the social context in each of the types of school in which the respondents were socialized is, in fact, somewhat similar with regard to general social climate. Both descriptive data on these types and the findings with regard to the socialization outcomes tend to confirm the assumption that the social contexts of the individual schools are indeed similar and that they can thus be grouped according to social climate.[14]

In summary, then, it is by the process of first measuring individual philosophies of theological education that personal data are gathered which are then aggregated to provide unit data for the school as a whole. The modal category for each seminary on the aggregated philosophies of theological education is taken to be the social climate of that school. Schools with common social climates are then grouped for analysis regarding their structural effects in the socialization process. Before turning to the analysis of these effects, however, it will be of some interest in the next two chapters to examine some of the correlates both of personal philosophies and of schools with similar social climates. To do so will, perhaps, contribute to the construct validity of the types and to further understanding of their implications for theological education.

---

[14] See David Nasatir, "A Note on Contextual Effects and the Political Orientation of University Students," American Sociological Review, XXXIII (April, 1968), pp. 210-219, for a similar type of analysis based on grouping.

CHAPTER V

PHILOSOPHIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION: SOME SOCIAL CORRELATES

By now it should be clear that social climates of theological schools--constructed by aggregating the respondent's personal philosophies of theological education--are central to this study. Considerable effort has been devoted to explicating their general meaning, their possible historical validity, and the way in which they were measured. The purpose of this chapter and the next is to attempt further to clarify and explicate the meaning both of the social climates and the personal philosophies of theological education on which they are based. What follows, therefore, in these two chapters is the presentation of a considerable amount of descriptive data comparing, first, the four personal philosophies and, following that, the three seminary types. In spite of the lengthy presentation of data that is involved, this description seems important for two reasons. It seems important, first, for further establishing the validity of the philosophies and social climates as constructs.[1] Secondly, consideration of the correlates of the philosophies and social climates should be of use in interpreting the findings to be presented in ensuing chapters regarding the major hypotheses. In this chapter attention is focused on the philosophies of theological education.

---

[1] For a discussion of various aspects and problems of the validity of measurements, see Claire Selltiz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch, and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations, revised one-volume edition (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), pp. 154-166.

Individual philosophies of theological education are the personal data out of which the unit data, representing social climates, have been constructed. The philosophies express, as was suggested in Chapter Two, the individual's basic expectations regarding theological education. As conceptualized and measured here, there are four possible philosophies, based on ranking of the goals of theological education. As indicated in the preceding chapter, I am calling these philosophies (1) Tradition/Spiritual, (2) Practical/Spiritual, (3) Tradition/Secular and (4) Practical/Secular. When the respondents were grouped according to these four types, there were 39.9% who were Tradition/Spiritual, 24.6% who were Practical/Spiritual, and 22.8% who were Tradition/Secular, and 12.7% who were Practical/Secular.[2]

---

[2] The N for these percentages if 1453. There were 131 respondents who could not be scored because they did not answer the philosophies question according to instructions; that is, these respondents either ranked only one goal, or they gave tied ranks to two or more goals. They are omitted from the analysis in those places where personal philosophies are considered. This loss of such a significant number of cases was unfortunate; however, since sampling problems were already such as to make difficult any firm assurance of representativeness, and since verification of theoretical hypotheses regarding social climates rather than description, is the primary aim, it was decided to proceed with the analysis, omitting those respondents who could not be clearly classified.

Given the fact that the sample can be sub-divided into these four types of philosophies, the question can then be raised as to the factors associated with these types. Are there certain factors in the social backgrounds or personalities on which the persons holding the four philosophies differ? Or, are the philosophies more likely to be responses or adaptations to the dominant social climate encountered by the student upon becoming a student in the seminary? Actually, there is probably no either/or answer to the question. Both factors are undoubtedly operative. Clearly, prior socialization would be expected to have considerable influence upon the selection of a seminary, and, in addition, there are probably associations between the major "thrust" of a given philosophy of theological education and a person's prior socialization experiences. Becker and his associates refer to this influence of background experiences as the "latent culture" which students bring with them to the school.

> People carry culture with them when they leave one group setting for another; they do not shed their cultural premises. Something is true for the person by virtue of the fact that he has another social identity which draws its being from another social group.[3]

Likewise, however, if the theoretical assumptions that underlie a structural effects analysis are correct, then the prevailing social climate of the seminary would significantly influence the philosophy an individual adopts, regardless of his prior socialization and latent culture. That is, the more or less shared goal preferences of other members of the seminary community--faculty and students--would act as a social constraint, encouraging conforming attitudes on the part of new recruits to the seminary. While it is not the primary purpose of the research to decide between background as opposed to seminary influences on socialization, some possible insight perhaps will come as a by-product of describing the social correlates of those choosing the various philosophies. We will look first at some background characteristics of the four types of respondents prior to the seminary and then at a few aspects of their participation in the life of the seminary community.[4]

---

[3] Becker, et al., Boys in White, op. cit., p. 143. See also the pages following.

I. PRE-SEMINARY CORRELATES

A considerable number of theoretically important background characteristics were measured. Not all of them, however, proved to be significantly associated with the types. Only those characteristics which were significantly associated with the four philosophies are mentioned, and, even here, I have chosen to be selective.[5] The fact that the correlates to be reported in this section occurred temporally prior to the adoption of one of the four philosophies would normally lead one to treat these pre-seminary correlates as independent variables. Methodologically, it would therefore be proper to compute percentages using the N for the categories of the independent variable as the base number. However, the primary concern in this section is not so much to account for the four philosophies by prior variables understood causally. Rather, it is to describe and, especially, to compare the four philosophy groups. For this reason, percentages have been computed using the N for each philosophy group as the base, and, unless otherwise noted, the discussion will proceed on the basis of these column percentages.

---

[4] The reader should recall the warning given earlier that sampling problems make it impossible to generalize the following descriptions to any larger population of seminary students. Further tests, with a carefully drawn random sample, will be necessary before one can say that all persons who adopt one or the other of the four philosophies are likely to have such and such characteristics. The descriptions that follow can be legitimately claimed to hold only for the members of this sample.

[5] The test used in most cases is the chi square test of independence. Chi square tests, however, are not always adequate,

Father's occupation (Table 3) is to some extent associated with the various philosophies. While the modal category for each philosophy is white collar, those holding the Tradition/Secular philosophy are more likely than the others to have had professionals (other than clergymen) as fathers. They are also less likely to have had farmer or blue collar

---

especially when there is a relatively large sample, as is the case in this study. As William L. Hays has written: "If N is very large, as it should be for the best application of the test, virtually any 'degree' of true statistical relationship between attributes will show up as a significant result. The test detects virtually any departure from strict independence between the attributes for these large sample sizes." Statistics for Psychologists (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 613. For this reason, I have included only those comparisons with sufficiently large (5% or better) differences or those which suggest some particularly interesting relationship.

TABLE 3

FATHER'S OCCUPATION BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Father's Occupation	Tradition/ Spiritual	Practical/ Spiritual	Tradition/ Secular	Practical/ Secular
	%	%	%	%
Professional	12.1	11.7	18.4	13.7
Clergy	15.3	13.7	15.1	10.4
White Collar	32.4	37.4	38.4	39.9
Blue Collar	23.3	19.6	17.8	21.9
Farm	16.9	17.6	10.3	14.2
N =	(590)	(358)	(331)	(183)

fathers. The measure of father's occupation was supplemented by use of the socio-economic index developed by Otis D. Duncan,[6] which is a composite index of occupational prestige. Table 4 reports the tests for differences of means on the socio-economic index when those holding the four philosophies are compared with each other. The joint

---

[6] See Albert J. Reiss, with Cecil C. North, Paul K. Hatt, and Otis D. Duncan, Occupation and Social Status (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961). For each of the occupations included in the index, the North-Hatt occupational prestige score was predicted by the percentage of males with incomes of $3,500 or above and the percentage of males completing high school in each occupation.

TABLE 4

COMPARISONS OF MEANS OF THE SCORES FOR FATHER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS FOR THE FOUR GROUPS HOLDING DIFFERING PHILOSOPHIES OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION
(t tests)*

	Tradition/ Spiritual		Practical/ Spiritual		Tradition/ Secular		Practical/ Secular	
	Diff. Mean	t	Diff. Mean	t	Diff. Mean	t	Diff. Mean	t
Tradition/Spiritual	-	-	-.53	-.32	-6.57	-3.94*	-3.21	-1.56
Practical/Spiritual	-	-	-	-	-6.04	-3.22*	-2.69	-1.20
Tradition/Secular	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.36	1.49
Practical/Secular	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

*two-tailed test significant at .001 (the overall or joint confidence level for the entire table is not significant).

confidence level for the table[7] is not statistically significant; however, two of the individual differences between groups are significant. In both cases it is the Tradition/Secular philosophy holders who are involved, having fathers with significantly higher mean socio-economic index than either the Tradition/Spiritual group or the Practical/Spiritual group. Thus, both the occupation and socio-economic index comparison indicate that those who adopt the Tradition/

---

[7] The joint confidence level for a table with orthogonal variables is one minus the product of each individual significance level in the table.

Secular perspective tend to have had fathers in the higher status occupations. This suggests that adopting a Tradition/Secular philosophy is influenced by the life-styles and values of the socio-economic status group in which early socialization occurred, or that father's occupation and general socio-economic status influenced the selection of a seminary in which the Tradition/Secular philosophy was modal. Also, both sets of findings suggest that for a number of clergymen, the ministry has been a channel of upward mobility, especially for those holding the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual philosophies, and, to a lesser extent for the Practical/Secular group. Those least likely to have been upwardly mobile through entering this ministry are those in the Tradition/Secular group.[8] These

---

[8] The socio-economic index value for a clergyman is 52. The possible range of the index is from 0 to 100. Means for father's occupation on the socio-economic index for each of the philosophy groups are as follows:

Tradition/Spiritual	43.96
Practical/Spiritual	44.49
Tradition/Secular	50.53
Practical/Secular	47.17

If we can assume that the index values regarding status are essentially the same for fathers and sons in spite of the time difference, then there is only a small difference between the Tradition/Secular men and their fathers, while the difference grows progressively larger for the other three groups. It should be mentioned in this connection that Duncan (Ibid., p. 131) indicates that the index value for clergy may be too low because of difficulties related to measuring accurately a minister's income (e.g., census income figures do not include the value of nonmonetary perquisites, such as rent-free parsonages). If the index value should, in fact, be higher than 52, this makes the upward mobility of the sons in comparison with their fathers even greater, including also the Tradition/Secular men.

findings are in line with others which suggest that clergymen are especially likely to have been intergenerationally upwardly mobile, as compared with many other professional groups. This has led some to suggest that the ministry, along with teaching, is a poor man's profession. That is, these professions provide relatively easier access from lower status to higher professional status than some other professions.[9]

In examining denominational differences (Table 5), it makes more sense to compare by denomination rather than by philosophy, thus row percentages have been computed for this table. Tradition/Spiritual was the modal category for each denomination except for Presbyterians, who were slightly more likely to have been Tradition/Secular. Lutherans of both varieties have the largest proportions in the Tradition/Spiritual category, with Missouri Synod Lutherans (MSL) twice as likely as Methodists and Presbyterians to be in this category. The Practical/Secular philosophy received the least approval by all denominations except for the MSL ministers, who least favored the Tradition/Secular philosophy.

While no significant differences appeared in answer to a question regarding participation in religious activities during high

---

[9] See, for example, Donald Super, The Psychology of Careers (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), p. 28. Also, see Bridston and Culver, Pre-Seminary Education, op. cit., p. 90, and Anthony P. M. Coxon, "A Sociological Study of the Social Recruitment, Selection and Professional Socialization of Anglican Ordinands" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leeds, England, 1965), p. 268.

TABLE 5

DENOMINATION BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION (PERCENTAGES COMPUTED ON ROW SUMS)

Denomination	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %	N=
Methodist	30.1	26.5	25.3	18.0	(438)
Presbyterian	30.5	22.0	34.2	13.2	(295)
American Baptist	43.4	22.9	21.7	12.0	(83)
Missouri Synod Lutheran	61.2	20.9	7.9	10.1	(139)
Episcopal	40.6	27.2	22.2	10.0	(180)
American Lutheran	52.8	25.9	14.1	7.2	(305)
Other	23.1	7.7	53.3	15.4	(13)

school (over 70% of each group was highly involved), some differences did appear when respondents were asked to describe their degree of religious commitment through high school (Table 6). Both the Practical/Secular and Tradition/Secular groups indicated less commitment than the other two groups. The Tradition/Spiritual group was most likely (61.4%) to indicate a high degree of commitment. While admittedly, this is a difficult attribute to measure, especially by self-ascribed ratings involving recall, the findings nevertheless fit the expectations that the theoretical and historical discussions might lead one to have regarding the characteristics of those holding the differing philosophies.

TABLE 6

SELF-ASCRIBED RELIGIOUS COMMITMENT DURING HIGH SCHOOL BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Self-Ascribed Religious Commitment During High School	Tradition/ Spiritual	Practical/ Spiritual	Tradition/ Secular	Practical/ Secular
	%	%	%	%
Low	12.8	12.6	18.8	19.3
Moderate	25.8	29.6	28.9	30.4
High	61.4	57.8	52.3	50.3
N =	(577)	(358)	(329)	(181)

Parental participation in the life of the church was relatively high for all groups. Mothers' participation was high for all groups (ranging from 68.6% to 72.9%) and was not statistically significant. Fathers' religious participation (Table 7) was lower for all groups, than was that of mothers; and, furthermore, significant differences did occur between the various philosophy groups. Fathers of the Practical/Secular group had the greatest proportion of low participation among the four types (32%), while the Tradition/Secular men were next. The same two groups had fewer fathers in the high participant category. Here again there are differences apparent between the two groups which ranked secular awareness higher than spiritual formation, when compared with the groups for whom spiritual formation was more highly ranked. In spite of lack of significant differences regarding mothers'

TABLE 7

FATHER'S RELIGIOUS PARTICIPATION BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Father's Religious Participation	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Low	26.6	22.2	28.4	32.0
Moderate	12.1	18.5	14.4	11.6
High	61.3	59.3	57.2	56.9
N =	(571)	(351)	(327)	(182)

participation, the high participation reported for mothers, mentioned above, suggests the importance of the mother's influence in religious matters, which other studies have also pointed out.[10] The question of occupational choice is an interesting but quite complex one.[11] Even more complex in discussions of clergymen, whether the discussions are normative or empirical, is the concept of the call to the ministry.[12] Because socialization rather than occupational choice--including the call to the ministry--is the major concern of this study, I have not gone into these latter concerns, especially that of the call, in any detail, except as they have implications for socialization. Account was taken of Coxon's discovery of important differences between those who enter the ministry in a normal manner (defined as those who decided to enter the ministry prior to age 20, and whose entry into the ministry is uninterrupted by full-time, non-ministerial employment for more than two years, excluding military service) as compared with those who are late deciders (who were 20 or over on deciding and worked in other occupations for more than two years).[13] Tables 8 and 9 summarize the findings regarding the four philosophy groups when they are further divided as described above into normal and late choosers.

---

[10] See James G. Ranck, "Some Personality Correlates of Theological Conservatism and Liberalism," The Drew Gateway, XXVII (Winter, 1957), pp. 59-70. Also, see Snell Putney and Russell Middleton, "Rebellion, Conformity, and Parental Religious Ideologies," Sociometry, XXIV (June, 1961), pp. 125-35. Also, for some indication of the importance of mothers' influence for success in the ministry, see Philip J. Allen, "Childhood Backgrounds of Success in a Profession," American Sociological Review, XX (1955), pp. 186-190.

[11] See Eli Ginsberg, Sol W. Ginsburg, Sidney Axelrod, John L. Herman, Occupational Choice (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951). Also, see Coxon, "Anglican Ordinands."

---

[12] As Carroll Wise has written, "Even theologians do not agree on exactly what constitutes a call, and this is to be expected from the nature of the situation. The call to the ministry is not a matter of fact; it is a theological interpretation of a complex constellation of processes and experiences in the life of a person." "The Call to the Ministry," Pastoral Psychology, IX (1958), p. 7. This is not to suggest that the concept of the call is of no concern to the behavioral scientist, but only that it is complex and that it has normative dimensions which fall beyond the scope of sociology. For one of several attempts to study the call to the ministry empirically, see Frederick W. Kling, "The Motivation of Ministerial Candidates," Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service Research Bulletin, pp. 59-62, 1959 (mimeographed).

[13] Coxon, "Anglican Ordinands," pp. 23 ff. and passim. See also Jacob J. Lindenthal, "Entrance Into the Ministry at Two Points in Life: Some Findings," Journal For the Scientific Study of Religion, VII (Fall, 1968), pp. 284-285; and Lindenthal, "The Delayed Decision to Enter the Ministry: Some Issues and Prospects," Review of Religious Research, IX (Winter, 1968), pp. 108-114.

The first table reveals a slight difference between philosophy groups on the normal-late dimension. Both groups which ranked practical competence higher than mastery of the tradition tend to have slightly more late choosers than the Tradition/Spirituals or Tradition/Seculars. It may be that work in non-ministerial occupations influences a more favorable appraisal of "practical" aspects of theological education than the more cognitively oriented disciplines. Although differences of measurement make comparability difficult, it is interesting to note that Lindenthal found that the "delayed seminarians" (my Late Choice group) scored significantly lower on the theoretical dimension using the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values than did the "non-delayed seminarians" (my Normal group).[14]

TABLE 8

DECISION TO ENTER MINISTRY BY PHILOSOPHY
OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Decision to Enter Ministry	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Normal Choice	83.6	78.5	83.8	77.2
Late Choice	16.4	21.5	16.2	22.8
N =	(574)	(354)	(328)	(180)

p = .06

---

[14] Lindenthal, "Entrance Into the Ministry At Two Points in Life," p. 285.

The other table (Table 9) relating to occupational choice reports findings regarding the Normal and Late groups in relation to the age in which the respondents first considered the ministry. This variable was chosen because of its conceivable importance for anticipatory socialization. Presumably, as was suggested in the introductory chapter, any contact with other ministers is a form of anticipatory socialization, whether one has considered the ministry as an occupational choice or not; however, if a person has given some consideration to entering the ministry, it seems plausible that his anticipatory socialization might be somewhat more significant. While the Late Choice sub-table is not itself statistically significant, it enables comparisons with the Normal Choice Group. As might be expected, considerable differences in age of first considering the ministry are evident between the two groups. Looking only at differences between those who were 17 or over when they first considered the ministry, it can be seen that the Late Choice Tradition/Secular men were two and one-half times more likely to have first considered the ministry at this rather late period of occupational choice. A 30% differential separates the Normal and Late Choice men in both the Traditional/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual groups. The difference is consideraby less for the Practical/Secular types; however, it still exceeds 15%. Clearly, the Normal Choice group, in all philosophy categories, has undergone more anticipatory socialization than has the Late Choice group, if age of first consideration is associated with anticipatory

TABLE 9

AGE FOR NORMAL AND LATE GROUPS AT THE TIME WHEN THE MINISTRY WAS FIRST CONSIDERED BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

a. Normal Group	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Under 10	8.8	6.5	5.8	6.5
10-13	27.6	25.6	16.4	10.8
14-15	16.3	16.9	18.9	15.1
16-17	21.0	22.3	29.1	32.4
Over 17	27.3	28.8	29.8	35.3
N =	(480)	(278)	(275)	(139)
b. Late Group*				
Under 10	5.3	3.9	-	4.9
10-13	17.0	15.8	11.3	9.8
14-15	6.4	5.3	1.9	9.8
16-17	12.8	14.5	13.2	24.4
Over 17	58.3	60.5	73.6	51.3
N =	(94)	(76)	(53)	(41)

* Not statistically significant.

socialization. Within the former group, there are also differences. The Tradition/Spiritual men are most likely to have considered the ministry prior to age 14, while the Practical/Secular men are least likely to have done so. The Traditional/Secular and the Practical/Secular groups tend to be the latest to consider the ministry of the four groups. This may be related also to the previously reported finding regarding a slightly lower degree of religious commitment during high school on the part of these two groups as compared with the others.

Table 10 reports the individual designated as having had the most significant influence on the respondent's decision to enter the ministry. While the differences were small, for the most part, it was home pastors and parents, in that order, who were the significant influences on the decision to enter the ministry for each of the types. When those who were significant persons in the decision were compared according to the age in which the decision was made (in a table not included here), it was discovered that parents were more important for those who made the decision early, that is, by age fifteen or earlier. For those between the years of sixteen and eighteen, the home pastor was a more important influence in the decision, while the proportion indicating that parents were important dropped from four out of ten to two out of ten. Between nineteen and twenty-five years of age--the college years--the home pastor's influence declined to some extent, but it increased again significantly for those who decided at age twenty-five or later.

TABLE 10

SIGNIFICANT PERSON AT THE TIME OF DECISION TO ENTER MINISTRY BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Significant Person	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Father	15.4	13.6	14.8	10.5
Mother	8.8	10.3	5.2	5.0
Home Pastor	32.1	34.2	31.0	38.7
Campus Minister	8.6	8.3	13.2	8.3
Wife	3.3	5.0	3.2	6.6
Youth Counselor	4.0	5.3	6.5	6.1
Denom. Official	5.3	4.4	7.4	6.1
Friend or Relative	15.8	15.9	12.9	16.0
Military Chaplain	2.2	.9	1.0	1.1
Teacher	4.4	2.1	4.8	1.7
N =	(545)	(339)	(310)	(181)

Given the previously noted tendency of the Tradition/Secular, and, especially, the Practical/Secular groups to consider the ministry at a later age than the other two groups, these findings regarding the differing patterns of influence for parents and home pastors help to interpret why it is, perhaps, that the Tradition/Secular and Practical/Secular groups are less likely to report parents as significant influences. Their decisions tended to come at times when either the home pastor (for the Practical/Secular group) or the campus minister along with the home pastor (for the Tradition/Secular group) were significant influences.

Do these slight variations in significant others influence the socialization process differentially? Unfortunately, the data are not sufficient to answer this question; however, one might speculate that the presumably more affective quality of relationship one has with one's parents may to some extent be associated with a more affective (e.g., the emphasis on Spiritual Formation) philosophy of theological education and a more expressive image of ministry (as will be considered below). This, however, is speculation which is unsupported at present by the data. Also, the relatively greater importance of campus ministers as significant influences for the Tradition/Secular group should be noted. Campus ministers tend to be somewhat atypical or unorthodox when compared with other ministers, especially those in the parish, and this is likely to have some impact on the perspective of those who count campus ministers as significant influences or adopt them as role models.[15]

---

[15] Not only will data presented later in the study confirm this with reference to those in this sample who are campus ministers, but two other recent studies also report the atypical nature of campus ministers. See Phillip E. Hammond and Robert E. Mitchell, "Segmentation of Radicalism--the Case of the Protestant Campus Minister," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXXI (September, 1965), pp. 133-143, and Phillip E. [illegible]mond, *The Campus Clergyman* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966), pp. 42 ff.

One further note concerning the home pastor as a significant influence should be mentioned. A small number of the respondents who indicated that the home pastor was the most significant influence qualified their choice by indicating that the influence was a negative one. That is, to quote one respondent, "He was so bad that I decided to enter the ministry to counteract what he and others like him were doing to the church." Responses such as this make one agree that "the Lord doth work in mysterious [and devious] ways his wonders to perform!"

A final set of comparisons of the background factors associated with the four philosophy groups concerns their college experience. There were no significant differences between the groups as to the type of college attended (over 60% of each group attended church-related colleges and universities), and there were only slight differences (although statistically significant) in major fields during college. Although it is not shown in the percentage computations presented in Table 11, the overall rank-order of college majors revealed a tie for first between religion or philosophy, on the one hand, and language or literature on the other (21%). Next came history and political science (19%), and then the behavioral sciences (18%). Only 5% were natural science majors. The largest percentage differences between groups are for the Tradition/Spiritual group (and to some extent the Tradition/Secular group) who had a considerably smaller proportion among behavioral science majors. On the other hand, the Practical/

Secular group is under-represented among history and political science majors.

TABLE 11

COLLEGE MAJOR BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

College Major	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Language/ Literature	23.1	21.5	18.5	18.5
Religion/ Philosophy	22.9	18.1	20.9	23.9
Art/Music/Drama	1.9	2.5	1.8	2.2
Sociology/Psychology/ Anthropology	13.4	20.1	16.7	26.6
Biological or Physical Science	5.7	4.8	4.2	2.2
Engineering	2.6	3.1	3.6	3.8
Economics/Business Administration	4.9	6.5	4.2	4.9
Political Science/ History	20.0	17.2	22.1	14.1
Other	5.6	6.2	7.9	3.8
N =	(576)	(354)	(330)	(184)

Also, regarding the college experience, Table 12 reveals some differences among groups with regard to college grades. Both groups emphasizing mastery of the tradition as compared with political competence were more likely to be A or B students than the other two groups.

TABLE 12

GRADES IN COLLEGE (AVERAGE) BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Grades in College	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
A	17.8	9.3	17.8	11.5
B	68.2	69.9	64.7	62.3
C	13.8	20.8	17.5	26.2
D	.2	-	-	-
N =	(579)	(356)	(331)	(183)

In summary, this section on background factors in relation to the four philosophy groups has reported a number of comparisons which reveal that there are some differences in social and personal backgrounds of the four groups of respondents. Presumably, these differences have relevance for the latent culture which the students "bring with them" to the seminaries. While the differences in most cases are not large, they reveal some peculiar characteristics of the various groups. In particular, the Tradition/Secular group tends to differ in several respects from the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual groups. Bridston and Culver somewhat pejoratively described the seminarians in their study as "church bound":

> . . . the Protestant seminarian is church bound, and doubly so. He is vocationally bound for a church occupation and sociologically bound by a religious and ecclesiastical ethos. That the "typical seminarian," after leaving his family home, is likely to have attended a church-related college and gone to a denominational seminary--both with the same religious ethos--leading to a position within a clerical caste which is the "hard core" of the religious-ecclesiastical sub-culture, would suggest that his educational progression is one which involves an increasing cultural narrowing and an increasing identification with the sub-culture to the exclusion of other cultural exposure.[16]

Although I would want to eschew the pejorative judgment contained in this statement (at least for the present), I would suggest that the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual men seem more closely to resemble the "church bound" "typical" seminarian than do either the Tradition/Secular or Practical/Secular men. Evidence presented in the next section will further support this contention. Furthermore, it is clear that the Practical/Secular men are also "deviant" at several important points from all of the other groups. Perhaps there are some clues in these differences as to a part of the reason that this philosophy failed to emerge as a modal social climate for any except the one seminary.

While these differences in background are not the major concern of the research, it does seem likely, from this rather cursory analysis, that some relationships do exist between factors in a person's social and personal background which predispose him towards one or the other orientations to theological education.

---

[16] Pre-Seminary Education, op. cit., p. 50.

At least it seems possible to suggest that prior experiences make one more or less susceptible to the constraints of the dominant social climate. This, I suspect, takes place particularly through the choice of peer groups. That is, I suspect that students form peer groups partly on the basis of similarities of previous experience and socialization (latent cultures), and that the peer group provides social support, either to enhance the acceptance of, or provide a buffer against, the dominant social climate of the seminary.[17] Unfortunately, the data do not allow for an adequate test of this hypothesis; although, limited consideration of peer influences will concern us below.

II. PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION AND SEMINARY EXPERIENCE

Having examined some differences in the backgrounds of those ascribing to the different philosophies of theological education, similar comparisons may now be made regarding various aspects of their seminary experiences. If, in fact, the philosophies of theological education express the respondents' preferences with regard to the goals of theological education, then it is plausible to expect that there will be differences among the four philosophy groups with regard to various aspects of the seminary experience. Here again it is difficult to say whether the differences are the result of differences in personal and social backgrounds--the latent culture the student brings with him to seminary--or differences in the constraint which the seminary social climate represents. The various comparisons that have been made which reveal statistically significant differences are summarized in the several tables of this section.

---

[17] See Everett K. Wilson, "The Entering Student: Attributes and Agents of Change," _College Peer Groups_, eds. Newcomb and Wilson (Chicago: Aldine Publishing House, 1966), pp. 71-106, for data to support this hypothesis. Also, see Becker, et al., _Boys in White_, pp. 143 ff.

Are there differences among the various groups with reference to the most important factor influencing their choice of seminary? The comparisons in Table 13 reveal several significant differences. For the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual groups, denominational affiliation of the seminary played a significant role. While there was no control exercised for the respondent's denomination, the relatively high number of Lutherans (MSL and ALC) ascribing to these two philosophies probably account for a sizable proportion of those choosing a seminary because of denominational affiliation. A very high proportion of Missouri Synod clergymen attend the two MSL seminaries in this country (Concordia, St. Louis, Missouri, and Concordia, Springfield, Illinois). A recent study reported that 97% of the denomination's living clergymen attended one or the other of the two seminaries.[18] While I do not have comparable data for

---

[18] Ross P. Scherer, "The Lutheran Ministry: Origins, Careers, Self-Appraisal," Information Service, XLII (April 27, 1963), p. 2.

TABLE 13

MAJOR REASON FOR CHOOSING SEMINARY BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Major Reason For Choosing Seminary	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Financial Aid	1.7	4.7	3.9	3.3
Location	10.2	10.1	10.3	17.9
Reputation	23.4	20.1	39.7	27.2
Denominational Affiliation	41.4	31.0	22.1	25.5
Non-Denominational Affiliation	.3	-	.9	-
Advice of Denominational Leaders	13.3	20.9	9.4	15.2
Friends Already Attending or Planning to Attend	7.6	9.5	8.5	8.2
Other	2.1	3.6	5.2	2.7
N =	(580)	(358)	(320)	(184)

the ALC clergymen, it is likely that the proportions attending ALC seminaries would be almost as great. One would surmise that the pressures in these somewhat theologically conservative denominations are quite strong for their ministers to attend a denominational seminary, and that these pressures stem from the two-fold concern discussed earlier in Chapter Three. On the one hand, there is the concern to maintain doctrinal standards. On the other hand, there may still be latent vestiges of the desire to maintain ethnic identity. The latter, however, is probably not nearly so strong a motivation (if it operates at all) as it was for first generation immigrants.

An unanswered question with reference to choice of seminary because of denominational affiliation is whether or not the choice was really desired by the student, or whether it was a response to pressure, official or unofficial, by denominational leaders. One would suspect that the latter circumstance would have a bearing on the person's participation in seminary and the degree of influence which the seminary has on him. Evidence supporting this hypothesis will be presented in later chapters when differences will be examined between those for whom the seminary was their first choice, and those for whom it was a second choice.

In contrast to the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual groups, the other two groups indicated the reputation of the seminary to be their major reason for choosing the seminary (the difference between reputation and denominational affiliation was a very slight one for the Practical/Secular group). This difference, particularly with reference to the Tradition/Secular group, may reflect the fact that two of the seminaries in which the Tradition/Secular philosophy is predominant (that is, the Graduate School model) are two of the most prestigious interdenominational seminaries in the United States. Those who attended these schools probably account for a sizable proportion of those choosing on the basis of reputation. Also, given the previous findings regarding the Tradition/Secular group, it is not too surprising to find them differing on this comparison as well. For whatever reason--perhaps denomination, or somewhat higher social status, or the advice of a significant other not included in the list--they tend to be less likely than the others to select a seminary for denominational reasons; and highly likely (four out of ten) to choose according to reputation.

Finally, the tendency of a larger proportion of the Practical/Spiritual group (and to some extent the Practical/Secular group) to follow the advice of denominational leaders should be noted. Again speculating as to possible explanations, it may be that there is a relationship between indicating practical competence as an important goal and following the advice of denominational leaders in the choice of a seminary. If the advice which I received may be generalized (see footnote one, Chapter One), I would suspect that denominational leaders tend to suggest seminaries which, in their estimation, produce men who are organizationally adept, and that men who follow these suggestions are more organizationally oriented.

Turning to aspects of the seminary experience proper, Table 14 reveals the distribution for each group as to major academic field of interest during seminary. Most seminaries do not have majors in the same sense as colleges and universities do; however, men frequently concentrate their work in areas which are especially interesting to them or relevant for their intended ministerial career. Also, one would suspect that one's philosophy of theological education would be associated with one's special field of interest. The findings clearly reveal the considerable difference between the Tradition/Spiritual and Tradition/Secular men, on the one hand, and the Practical/Spiritual and Practical/Secular, on the other hand. The former groups are almost twice as likely to have "majored" in biblical or theological/philosophical areas as the latter groups. On the other hand, the latter groups are three times as likely to have chosen pastoral care as a major field of interest. There are also similar differences in most of the other practical areas. These differences are not unanticipated, given the goal rankings that were used to assign the men to the four philosophies.

Similarly, those for whom secular awareness was ranked more highly than spiritual formation--that is, the Tradition/Secular and Practical/Secular groups--tended to "major" in Ethics and Society more frequently than the other two groups. The proportions for all groups, however, were relatively small in this category.

TABLE 14

MAJOR FIELD OF INTEREST DURING SEMINARY BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Major Field of Interest During Seminary	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Biblical	36.7	18.3	27.4	13.3
Historical	12.1	10.3	8.1	5.6
Theological/ Philosophical	24.3	16.0	31.6	16.1
Ethics and Society	5.8	3.7	12.1	15.0
Pastoral Care	10.6	31.7	11.5	33.9
Church Administration	.4	1.4	.9	1.1
Religion and the Arts	.9	.3	.9	-
Christian Education	3.0	7.4	2.5	7.8
Homiletics and Liturgics	3.7	10.0	4.0	3.9
Other	1.6	.9	.9	3.3
N =	(568)	(350)	(321)	(181)

The various findings with regard to major field of interest are not, as was suggested above, particularly surprising. Nevertheless, they add some validity to the types as constructs.

Grade point averages in seminary--as in college--also differ significantly among the four groups (Table 15). Again, the two groups expressing more cognitive interests--that is, mastery of the tradition as a salient goal--have higher grades than their more practically oriented counterparts.

Much of seminary life is not academic. Apart from classes, field work, and grades, there are many formal and informal activities that are potentially quite influential for socialization. It is probably in the informal interaction in dormitory bull sessions, during coffee breaks, over meals, or in other less official kinds of interaction that much important socialization occurs.[19] In these activities, too, one would expect that the structural effects of the dominant social climate are most fully experienced.

Several potentially important activities were listed, and respondents were asked to rate their degree of participation in them. Again, I am reporting only those which tend to differentiate

---

[19] In a study of seminary field work, Edwin L. Becker reports the importance of Sunday night "bull sessions" with peers for those returning from weekend field work assignments. These discussions tended to be important in dealing with problems that arose in the practice of ministry and in the development of role images. "Religious Field Work as Experience in the Social Roles of the Minister," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University Divinity School, 1954, pp. 142-143.

TABLE 15

AVERAGE GRADE DURING SEMINARY BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Average Grade During Seminary	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
A	21.3	8.7	17.7	10.3
B	68.6	75.6	77.1	69.0
C	10.1	15.7	5.2	20.7
D	-	-	-	-
N =	(574)	(356)	(328)	(184)

significantly between the four philosophy groups. Table 16 records the proportions in each group who rated the activity as one in which he regularly participated (scoring it as a one or a two on a five point rating scale). It will be noted that in every activity listed--except the one regarding denominational activities--there are consistent differences (some large and some small) between the groups ranking spiritual formation as more important than secular awareness, and vice-versa. As expected, those more oriented towards the secular are more highly represented in all those activities which have some reference to "the things of the world." The relatively small percent reporting regular involvement in social and political action groups would probably be somewhat higher were the current generation of seminarians to be surveyed. My impression is

TABLE 16

REGULAR PARTICIPATION IN SELECTED ACTIVITIES DURING SEMINARY* BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Regular Participation in Selected Activities During Seminary*	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Cultural events in the community	33.3	28.3	41.0	35.0
Social and political action groups	9.5	8.2	20.8	20.7
Classes and/or lectures in secular disciplines	10.5	7.9	19.7	15.3
Ecumenical activities	17.0	15.5	27.7	19.2
Denominational activities	45.0	54.6	34.4	50.6
Corporate worship in the seminary	90.1	93.5	77.5	77.7

*Note: The percentages reported here are only for those indicating regular participation. Other degrees of participation are not reported. Thus, the columns do not total to 100%. N's are not reported, since they vary slightly from question to question. However, they are approximately the same as those reported for each philosophy in the preceding tables.

that a significant number (perhaps still a minority) have become increasingly politicized and activist in orientation.[20]

In addition to the previously mentioned differences, the Tradition/Secular and Practical/Secular groups were slightly more likely to be involved in ecumenical activities than the others. On the other hand, corporate worship in the life of the seminary was considerably more salient for both the Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual groups.

The one activity which did not reflect the spiritual-secular continuum was participation in denominational activities. Here it was the tradition-practical continuum that was reflected in the difference. A significantly larger proportion of the Practical/Spiritual and Practical/Secular men were regular participants in denominational activities. While, unfortunately, no further information is available regarding the nature and circumstances of this participation in denominational affairs, it seems to provide additional weight to the previous suggestion that these two groups are more organizationally oriented.

Several questions relating to peer group activity were also asked; however, the activities listed and the findings were considerably similar to the activities reported above. Both sets of findings, like those relating to major academic field of interest, lend further weight to the construct validity of the types. Furthermore, they help to give insight into behavioral aspects of seminary which will make the findings regarding socialization outcomes more understandable.

---

[20] See, for example, "Antiwar Movement Making Gains Among Seminarians," The New York Times, March 3, 1968, p. 1. Also, see, H. James Lawrence, "The Duke Silent Vigil," The Duke Divinity School Review, XXXIII (Spring 1968), pp. 89-108, for a case history of social action involvement in one seminary and university context.

III. PHILOSOPHIES OF THEOLOGICAL ECUCATION AND MINISTERIAL CAREERS

One final set of comparisons concerning the four philosophies should be considered. This has reference to the choice of a ministerial career specialization. As in other professions, the man who chooses ministry as a professional career may move through a succession of very similar jobs, or, with the general increase in ministerial specialization, he may move from one specialization to another.[21] The trend towards specialization within occupations, which is a major feature of the contemporary occupational structure, has clearly not left the ministry untouched. Charles Feilding cites one list of twenty-three different categories of ministerial specialties (which could easily be further sub-divided).[22]

The increase in ministerial specialization has had an impact on theological schools. While the parish ministry is still perhaps the major focus of the preparation for ministry offered in most seminaries, training for specialized functions within the parish ministry as well as for specialized non-parish ministries is increasingly being provided for in seminaries. Furthermore, an increasing number of students are choosing non-parish specializations, either as immediate or future career choices. The Bridston-Culver study indicated the extent to which this is the case. While 68% of all seminarians questioned planned to enter the parish ministry upon graduation, only 33% saw the parish as their future ministerial specialization.[23] The authors point out that these findings do not represent firmly fixed choices, but, primarily, they reveal that the disenchantment with parish ministry is rather strong.

---

[21] For the distinction between "occupational career" and "job," see Robert Dubin, The World of Work (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958), p. 276. Also, see Donald Super, The Psychology of Careers, op. cit., p. 8.

[22] Education For Ministry, op. cit., pp. 79-80.

The whole subject of specialization within the ministry and the apparently growing tendency of seminarians to express preference for non-parish specializations are two considerably complex topics which cannot be considered here. At a later point in this study, I will return to the question of disenchantment with the parish, and the ministry in general, as it relates to ministerial morale. At present, however, the major concern is with what significant differences are evident between the different philosophy groups with regard to ministerial specializations.

It will be recalled that at the time the Danforth sample was drawn, only two categories of ministers were sampled: parish and campus ministers. This probably means that the sample is not representative of those who were in other ministerial specializations at that time, and that, had they been included, the distribution would have been different. While this is no doubt correct, the data reported in Table 17 are those collected in the 1968 follow-up survey three years after the original Danforth Study. The fact that a number of the respondents are currently in ministries other than parish or campus ministries is indicative of considerable job mobility within the ministry (and in some cases out of the ministry). The major concern of the table, however, is not with mobility, but with potential differences among the four philosophy groups.

---

[23] _Pre-Seminary Education_, _op_. _cit_., pp. 102-104.

For all groups, the overwhelming percentage anticipated a career in the parish ministry. The Practical/Spiritual men lead the list, with eight out of ten having anticipated the parish. On the other hand, the Tradition/Secular group indicates the smallest proportion having anticipated the parish; although this still includes approximately two-thirds of the group. Both for the Tradition/Spiritual and Tradition/Secular groups college or seminary teaching was the second largest category; and for the latter group, this was followed closely by campus ministry.

When ministry actually entered at graduation is considered, it can be seen that the proportions entering the parish are roughly the same as for anticipated ministry. An even larger proportion entered

TABLE 17

TYPE OF MINISTRY AT DIFFERENT TIME PERIODS BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

a. Type of Ministry Anticipated Eventually	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Parish Minister	72.7	80.9	65.4	71.9
Associate Minister	1.2	1.6	1.6	2.9
Minister of Education	1.9	2.5	2.3	3.5
College or Seminary Teaching	8.5	2.5	9.2	4.7
Military Chaplain	2.5	2.5	4.2	2.9
Institutional Chaplain	3.7	3.1	3.3	3.5
Campus Minister	3.9	1.6	8.5	4.7
Denominational Administration	.4	2.2	.3	1.8
Ecumenical Affairs	.2	-	-	1.2
Missions	5.0	3.1	5.2	2.9
N =	(517)	(319)	(306)	(171)

(Table 17 continued)

b. Type of Ministry Entered at Graduation	Tradition/ Spiritual	Practical/ Spiritual	Tradition/ Secular	Practical/ Secular
	%	%	%	%
Parish Minister	70.8	75.1	62.3	69.8
Associate Minister	15.2	13.7	20.1	17.0
Minister of Education	1.4	2.9	4.9	3.8
College or Seminary Teaching	1.1	-	1.2	-
Military Chaplain	1.1	.9	.6	.5
Institutional Chaplain	.5	.9	1.9	.5
Campus Minister	4.0	.9	5.9	3.3
Denominational Administration	.2	-	-	1.1
Ecumenical Affairs	.2	-	-	-
Missions	5.6	5.7	3.1	3.8
N =	(571)	(350)	(324)	(182)

(Table 17 continued)

c. Type of Ministry Presently Engaged In	Tradition/ Spiritual %	Practical/ Spiritual %	Tradition/ Secular %	Practical/ Secular %
Parish Minister	74.0	76.8	58.6	65.2
Associate Minister	5.2	4.7	7.6	9.2
Minister of Education	1.6	1.4	1.5	3.3
College or Seminary Teaching	1.9	2.5	4.8	3.8
Military Chaplain	1.4	.6	.9	-
Institutional Chaplain	1.9	1.4	1.2	2.2
Campus Minister	6.7	5.6	13.0	7.6
Denominational Administration	.9	2.2	3.9	1.6
Ecumenical Affairs	.9	-	.6	1.1
Missions	2.1	1.7	2.2	3.0
Non-Ecclesiastical Occupation	3.6	3.1	4.8	3.8
N =	(580)	(358)	(331)	(184)

the parish when those becoming associate ministers are considered (from 82% to 89%).

In the final panel of the table, when current ministry is compared with ministry at graduation, and within the four philosophy groups, several interesting findings are evident. The overall proportions in the parish ministry remain similar with some slight fluctuations evident. The largest change occurs, as would be expected, in the associate minister category. In most cases, men do not remain for long tenures as associates. But, when the categories in Table 17 of parish ministry and associate ministry (which is a form of parish ministry) are combined, an interesting pattern occurs (Table 18).

TABLE 18

COMBINED PARISH AND ASSOCIATE MINISTER CATEGORIES OF TABLE 17, BY PHILOSOPHY OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

Combined Parish and Associate	Tradition/ Spiritual	Practical/ Spiritual	Tradition/ Secular	Practical/ Secular
Anticipated Ministry	73.9	82.5	67.0	74.8
Ministry at Graduation	86.0	88.8	82.4	86.8
Ministry at Present	79.2	81.5	66.2	74.4

There are few differences of proportions in the ministry anticipated and the ministry engaged in currently. This may indicate only that in a question asking for recall, the respondents' answers on the "ministry anticipated" question were colored by a desire to justify their present type of ministry as the one which was anticipated. Or, the similarities may be real, indicating that men do in fact follow the plans made during seminary (which bodes ill for the parish ministry when the previously reported Bridston-Culver findings are considered).

More interesting perhaps are the differences of proportion between those who entered some form of parish ministry (parish minister or associate) upon graduation and those in the parish now. The differences are most marked in the Tradition/Secular category, followed by the Practical/Secular, the Practical/Spiritual, and the Tradition/Spiritual groups in that order. Although the relative proportions (Table 17) of men remaining as senior parish ministers are relatively stable, it is clear that a sizable number of men move out of the parish when the combined categories are considered. Further, it is especially the Tradition/Secular and Practical/Secular men who do so, again emphasizing their relative difference as compared with the other two groups. For all groups, but especially for the Tradition/Secular group, the campus ministry is the most popular alternate career specialization (although this may be an artifact of sampling rather than a bona fide finding).

Finally, there are those who are no longer in positions that are explicitly ministerial. Actually, one has considerable difficulty determining by what criteria to classify a man as in or not in the ministry. Several of the men in the study, for example, reported as their present ministry a job with the government's anti-poverty program. Another minister reported that he was on leave from his campus ministry to serve as ombudsman for his campus under appointment by the university administration. Yet, most of these men indicated that this, for them, was ministry and that they were maintaining their ministerial credentials. It was difficult, therefore, to decide when to draw the line in cases such as these. With others--such as one man who is now a computer programmer--there was no problem. The decision finally was made to adopt as the criterion whether the man was serving under ecclesiastical auspices or not,[24] and this was not always easy to determine (e.g., is a man who is now teaching religion in a private or state university not to be counted as still a minister while one who is teaching in a church-related school is included?).[25]

---

[24] James Gustafson has suggested the following criteria to judge normatively regarding the legitimacy of various ministries: "We may ask of any ministry alleged to be Christian, a) in what way it communicates the gospel, b) whether it is a ministry of the church and not merely a private venture, c) whether it exhibits the respect for persons required by Christian faith, and d) whether it is directed toward the surrounding world and culture in a manner worthy of a body set in the world to be the light and agent of God's will for the unity of all." Cited in Feilding, Education For Ministry, op. cit., pp. 80-81.

[25] Graduate students also posed a special problem. Where men indicated that they were presently on leave in graduate school or clinical training with plans to return to some form of ministry, they were classified according to their previous or anticipated ministry. Where no plans were specified, they were classified under the heading

While these various problems of criteria for coding purposes were resolved in a less than satisfactory manner, the results are reported in the last row of Table 17. The differences in proportion for the various philosophies are not large enough to warrant any inference that one's philosophy is more highly related to entering a non-ecclesiastical occupation than another; however, when the type of work entered was examined, 46.2% of the Tradition/Secular group who had entered a non-ecclesiastical occupation were engaged in social work or some aspect of the anti-poverty program, as compared with 28.6% of the Tradition/Spiritual men and 7.7% each of the other two groups. There were no other large differences as to choice of occupation.

One other interesting statistic regarding these men bears mentioning. When the ones who had entered non-ecclesiastical specialties were classified as to the type of seminary from which they graduated, 53.8% had attended a seminary classified as a Graduate School. Religious Community graduates accounted for 26.9%, and Vocational Schools 19.2%. Whether these differences are the result of sampling error or constitute authentic differences is difficult to ascertain; however, findings to be reported below concerning ministerial morale in relation to the type of seminary attended lead me to suspect that the differences are significant.[26]

---

of "non-ecclesiastical specialization."

[26] For a detailed study of career change among ministers,

From the considerable amount of descriptive data that has been presented in this chapter, it has become evident that there do exist some interesting differences between those who reported that they ascribed to different philosophies of theological education during their seminary experience. These differences are apparent both in some of the personal and social characteristics which antedate the entry of the men into seminary and in differences which emerge regarding aspects of their seminary experience as well. While in some instances these differences are not large, they nevertheless are suggestive of some of the ways in which individual differences and prior socialization influence later life socialization experience, including professional socialization. Some of the more significant of these variables which have been considered will be used below as control variables in examining the relation between social climates and socialization outcomes.

Equally as important as their usefulness for descriptive purposes, the comparisons presented have given some indication of the validity of the personal philosophies as constructs. In a number of instances, it will be recalled, the tradition versus practical and the spiritual versus secular distinctions proved

---

see Edgar W. Mills, Jr., Career Change Among Ministers: A Socio-psychological Study. Harvard Studies in Career Development No. 46 (Cambridge, Mass.: Center For Research in Careers, May, 1966). Also, see Luke M. Smith, "The Clergy: Authority Structure, Ideology, Migration," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 242-248.

rather discriminating. While more adequate measurement of these philosophies is clearly needed, they do seem to have validity as analytical constructs. This is quite important, since they are the personal data from which the social climates--to which the following chapter is devoted--are derived.

CHAPTER VI

SOME CHARACTERISTICS OF THE TYPES OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS

If the question of the validity of personal philosophies was important, even more so is this question with reference to social climates or models of theological education, since the crux of the study is the relation of social climates to socialization outcomes. Furthermore, since the concept of social climate is a kind of summary measure--summarizing a number of aspects of the formal and informal organization of the schools--an understanding of some of the empirical correlates of these analytical types will be quite important in interpreting the findings to be presented in the following chapters. Therefore, in this section, I will present data regarding the three types of seminaries. Several comparisons are made by aggregating personal characteristics of the respondents into unit data about the seminaries, as was also done to derive the social climates. In several instances, the ministers were asked to serve as informants about the seminaries from which they graduated, reporting characteristics that would otherwise have been gathered through field observation, had that been possible. Finally, some data are reported which do not come from the respondents at all. Rather, they were derived from content analysis of seminary catalogues and from the Directory of Theological Schools, published by the American Association of Theological Schools.[1] These latter data, which are independent of the respondents, should provide a reasonably rigorous test of the validity of the seminary types. In most of the tables in this chapter, I have reported only those relationships which were statistically significant at the .05 level of confidence or less.

I. AGGREGATE CHARACTERISTICS OF GRADUATES OF EACH SEMINARY TYPE

The first table (Table 19) reports an aggregated measure derived from the Duncan socio-economic index.[2] As has previously

---

[1] Aute L. Carr (ed.), Directory of Theological Schools (Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1968).

[2] The index which ranges between 0 and 100 was broken into four levels. For the Low group, 0 - 19 was the range. The Moderately Low group included those whose fathers had scores ranging from 20 - 51. The Moderately High group ranged from 52 - 65, and the High group were those whose fathers' occupations had an index value of 66 or above. Typical occupations falling into the four levels are as follows:

Low:
6 Textile weavers
9 Janitors and Sextons
14 Farmers (owners and tenants)
15 Cab drivers and chauffeurs
19 Carpenters

Moderately Low:
25 Auto mechanics
33 Grocer (self-employed)
36 Jeweler
49 Telephone lineman
50 Tool and die makers and setters

TABLE 19

PERCENT IN THE THREE SEMINARY TYPES FROM VARYING SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS (FATHER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS)

	Seminary Types		
Father's Socio-Economic Status	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
Low	34.1	17.3	16.0
Moderately Low	21.4	28.2	25.9
Moderately High	25.6	25.4	23.1
High	19.0	29.2	34.9
N =	(837)	(284)	(424)

been mentioned, such measures as socio-economic status are important in that they symbolize certain uniformities in life-styles and values for individuals who occupy similar positions in the social structure. But it seems plausible to suggest that, when aggregated according to school type, a measure of socio-economic status might also reveal some

---

Moderately High:
- 52 Clergymen
- 54 Officials in local public administration
- 58 Locomotive engineers
- 61 Salesmen (wholesale trade)
- 62 Real estate agents and brokers

High:
- 66 Officials in state public administration
- 70 Stock and bond salesmen
- 78 Accountants
- 85 Banking and other finance
- 92 Physicians and surgeons
- 96 Dentists

insight into the seminaries themselves. Do the school types differ with regard to the modal socio-economic status of their recruits? And does the kind of value climate created by the typical status group have any effect on the socialization process? The latter question is not answered here; however, it would be unusual if there were not some effect. It is possible, however, to answer the former question. The types of schools do vary by social climate. The Religious Community and the Graduate School models go in almost exactly opposite directions, the former having a majority in the low category and the latter having a majority in the high category. The Vocational School is almost evenly divided from moderately low to high with no clearly modal category. The denominational affiliation of the seminaries would probably help to interpret this relationship to some extent had a control for denomination been exercised. This would not, however, reduce the importance which the modal socio-economic status of the schools conceivably has on the socialization process. Furthermore, the data give us some insight into the backgrounds of students who choose to attend the various types of seminaries or who are selected to attend by virtue of admission policies.[3]

---

[3] To my knowledge, no systematic study relating to criteria of selection in admissions policies of American theological schools exists (at least in a publicly available form). For a study of law schools, see Seymour Warkov, with Joseph Zelan, Lawyers in the Making (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company), 1965. Coxon, "Anglican Ordinands," p. 334, suggests that Anglican boards which select men for training for the priesthood tend to select candidates who seem to conform to their image of the priesthood and to reject those who do not seem to conform.

A second kind of unit measure of the seminary types comes from aggregating the types of undergraduate schools attended by the respondents (Table 20). It will be recalled that when the undergraduate school for the respondents was cross-tabulated with the four types of personal philosophies, no statistically significant differences were found. However, the chi square test was significant ($p < .001$) when type of seminary, rather than type of personal philosophy, was considered. Here the Vocational School and the Graduate School are most alike, with the Religious Community as the "deviant" type. The latter has almost 25% more graduates of church-related colleges and universities than do the other two types. The Vocational School has the largest proportion of public university or college graduates (over twice as many as the Religious Community). The Graduate School model has a slight edge over the Vocational School in graduates of private (non church-related) colleges and universities. These comparisons seem to make rather clear that the recruitment channels of the three types (or at least of the Religious Community versus the other two) differ significantly. I would suspect, again, that denomination accounts for a part of the difference. For example, the educational pattern for many of the older Missouri Synod Lutheran (MSL) ministers includes a denominational parochial school, a minor seminary ("prep" school) followed by the seminary proper (which was unambiguously of the Religious Community model). For the younger MSL men, the pattern would be somewhat similar except that now a college degree is required (but quite frequently still taken in an MSL sponsored college).[4]

TABLE 20

TYPE OF UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL ATTENDED BY SEMINARY TYPE

Type of Undergraduate School Attended	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
Public College	4.6	7.1	5.0
Public University	9.3	24.2	21.0
Private College	5.4	8.2	9.0
Private University	4.8	8.5	12.3
Church College	65.5	43.4	45.3
Church University	10.3	8.5	7.3
N =	(835)	(281)	(424)

A slight digression may be in order here to reflect on such a pattern as presented by the MSL (and, similarly, Roman Catholics) and its implications for socialization. In spite of the previously mentioned negative view of the "church-boundness" of the "typical seminarian" which Bridston and Culver took in their study, it is likely that the socialization patterns of groups such as the MSL are highly effective in penetrating into the deep levels of the person. Here the church can count on home, elementary school, high school and college combining with the seminary in the process.[5] Bridston and Culver may be correct in their judgment that such "church-boundness" is not functional for ministry in contemporary society,[6] a judgment with which I am in essential agreement; nevertheless, paradoxically, that which constitutes "church-boundness" is quite functional for deeply internalized values and norms.

---

[4] See Scherer, "The Lutheran Ministry," op. cit., p. 2.

Before turning to the next set of comparisons, I should add that the data regarding undergraduate schools are inadequate. Some indication is also needed concerning the quality of the schools attended. While, admittedly, this is a difficult attribute to measure (as will become evident below with reference to seminaries), a quality index of colleges would provide considerable insight into the recruitment patterns of seminaries and into the ethos of the different types of seminaries.

One other set of aggregate measures has been computed to provide insight into the seminary types. This involves several of the items reported previously in the discussion of philosophies of theological education concerning the degree to which certain kinds of activities were important during seminary. Table 21 summarizes these aggregated findings.[7] The Religious Community type is highest on corporate worship and lowest on participation in social and political action groups. The Vocational School is likewise high on corporate worship, but it is also higher than the other seminaries on participation in denominational activities. Lowest for the Vocational School is participation in classes or lectures in secular disciplines outside the seminary. Finally, although the Graduate School also has a high proportion of regular participants in corporate worship, there is a 16% difference between the Graduate School and the Religious Community. The largest difference between the Graduate School and the other types comes at the point of participation in social and political action groups.

---

[5] See Arthur Stinchcombe, "Social Structure and Organizations," *Handbook of Organizations*, James G. March, editor, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), pp. 186-187, for a discussion of the penetration of primary groups by a larger group so that the former become resources for socialization on behalf of the latter.

[6] For a criticism of traditional Roman Catholic theological education for reasons similar to Bridston and Culver's Protestant criticism, see Robert M. Brooks, O. Praem., "Sociological Dimensions of the Seminary," *Seminary Education In a Time of Change*, *op. cit.*, pp. 205-232.

All of these relationships make sense when historical and theoretical characteristics of the types are considered. The percentage differences between the Religious Community and Vocational School models, on the one hand, and the Graduate School,

---

[7] Percentage distributions are reported for three levels of participation rather than only for "regular" participation as in the previous chapter in order to make clearer the relationships. The five point scale on which each item was rated was grouped as follows: 1 or 2 = regularly; 3 = occasionally; 4 or 5 = rarely or never.

TABLE 21

PERCENT WITHIN EACH SEMINARY TYPE ENGAGING IN VARIOUS KINDS OF ACTIVITIES

Activities Engaged In During Seminary	Seminary Types: Religious Community	Vocational School	Graduate School
	%	%	%
1. Social and Political Action Groups			
Regularly	8.8	13.1	21.7
Occasionally	12.4	16.5	20.6
Rarely or Never	78.8	70.5	57.7
N =	(764)	(176)	(383)
2. Classes and/or Lectures in Secular Disciplines Outside the Seminary			
Regularly	12.5	10.9	15.8
Occasionally	22.5	29.9	20.0
Rarely or Never	65.0	59.2	64.2
N =	(769)	(174)	(380)
3. Corporate Worship in the Seminary			
Regularly	92.3	87.0	76.4
Occasionally	5.3	8.5	15.4
Rarely or Never	2.5	4.5	8.1
N =	(775)	(177)	(382)
4. Denominational Activities			
Regularly	48.2	52.2	35.5
Occasionally	31.0	22.5	24.2
Rarely or Never	20.8	25.3	40.3
N =	(768)	(178)	(380)

on the other, are in line with the importance given to Spiritual Formation in both of the former types. The moderately strong denominational emphasis in the Vocational School, followed closely by the Religious Community, also makes sense given the historical roots of this type. Finally, the relatively greater importance in the Graduate School of social and political action groups and participation in classes and/or lectures on secular topics outside the seminary is clearly in line with the orientation towards secular awareness which is a major characteristic of this type.

II. GRADUATES' REPORTS CONCERNING SEMINARY CHARACTERISTICS

It was mentioned earlier that, in lieu of field observation, several questions were asked in which the ministers were requested to serve as informants about the seminaries which they attended. The information was then aggregated by seminary type. Not all of the items proved to be substantively or statistically significant; however, one question that did discriminate moderately well between the three types of seminaries related to the graduates' perceptions of the attitudes of the various theological faculties towards the church as an institution. Over the past decade or so a considerable amount of criticism has come from various sources including members of seminary faculties about the failure, irrelevance or impotence of the institutional church, by which is usually meant both local parish churches and denominational bureaucracies.[8] Much of this criticism is no doubt justified. Furthermore, it is not unusual for professional school faculties to be the "moral watchdogs" and severest critics of the profession for failures to live up to the normative standards of the profession.[9] Nevertheless, the sharp criticisms of the church as an institution which have come from members of theological faculties, plus a tendency on the part of some theologians to ignore the human realities of the church in favor of theological dimensions,[10] have drawn the ire of both denominational officials and parish clergymen alike.

Recalling what was said previously in the historical section regarding the relatively greater separation of the Graduate School type of seminary from the control of the institutional church, it would be likely that faculties in these schools would be the most critical of the institutional church of the three types. Table 22 contains these comparisons. There is a trend from left to right across the table of increasing criticism of the church. Only a very few respondents in each type regarded the faculty as very critical, but the Religious Community faculties are generally quite supportive of the church in contrast to the Graduate School faculties, who are reported to be only moderately supportive or moderately critical. The Vocational School is in a middle position. In general, however, the differences are as expected.

---

[8] See, for example, Gibson Winter, The Suburban Captivity of the Church (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1961) and Peter Berger, The Noise of Solemn Assemblies (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961). These are only two of many books critical of the church as an institution, and they are cited only as examples of two widely read books by men who, at the time of writing, were teaching on seminary faculties. (Peter Berger has since left his position on a theological faculty).

[9] See Bernard Barber, "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," Daedalus, XCII (Fall, 1963), p. 675.

[10] For a particularly trenchant criticism of this latter tendency, especially prevalent among some of the neo-orthodox theologians, see James Gustafson, Treasure in Earthen Vessels (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961). See also Robert T. Osborn, "Docetic Heresy in Methodism Today," Christian Advocate (February 8, 1968), pp. 7-8.

TABLE 22

STUDENT'S PERCEPTION OF FACULTY'S ATTITUDE TOWARD
THE INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH BY SEMINARY TYPE

	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
Very Supportive	55.0	39.7	24.3
Moderately Supportive	31.9	40.7	39.4
Moderately Critical	12.7	18.0	31.3
Very Critical	0.6	1.6	5.0
N =	(834)	(188)	(421)

Another type of question on which the respondents were asked to report on the schools had to do with types of teaching methods used. A considerable amount of criticism has been directed at the traditional lecture method as being outmoded and ineffective when used almost exclusively. As John L. McKenzie has written, "The lecture method employed in theology has scarcely been modified since the fourteenth century. The lecture originated before the invention of printing . . . . There was no thought of turning the student loose in a library."[11] In the face of criticism, a number of departures from the lecture method have been suggested or institutionalized (independent study, seminars, clinical training, case studies, field observation, field education, etc.)[12]

To determine if there were significant differences among the three types of seminaries regarding these important pedagogical questions, respondents were asked concerning the frequent, occasional or rare use of various types of teaching methods. Interestingly, no significant differences occurred except for one type of pedagogical method--the use of seminars (Table 23). The Graduate School model had a considerably larger proportion reporting the regular use of seminars. This probably reflects the smaller faculty-student ratio (to be reported below) of the Graduate Schools as compared with the other types. Large faculty-student ratios frequently preclude the use of many seminars and necessitate large lecture classes. In spite of non-significant differences on the other types of teaching methods, it is interesting to note that such methods as independent study,

---

[11] John L. McKenzie, S. J., "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum" Theological Education in a Time of Change, op. cit., p. 409.

[12] See, for example, the discussions of innovations in supervision and of field work in Feilding, Education For Ministry.

TABLE 23

USE OF SEMINARS IN TEACHING BY TYPE OF SEMINARY

	Seminary Type		
	Religious Community	Vocational School	Graduate School
Widely Used	26.4	31.9	54.5
Occasionally Used	65.2	62.3	44.3
Rarely or Never	8.4	5.8	1.2
N =	(831)	(191)	(420)

supervised ministry, and field observation and experience appeared slightly more related to the Religious Community and Vocational School types than to the Graduate School. If these are accurate reports by the informants, then this would indicate a slight tendency for the former two types to be more innovative than the latter.[13]

A further way in which the ministers were asked to reflect on their seminary education as informants was to indicate the degree to which they regarded their seminary education as helpful in preparing them for various roles in which the minister is expected to engage and for issues about which he might be expected to be informed. Table 24 summarizes several of these items which are statistically significant and seem to be associated with the three seminary types.[14] Given the relatively wide range of years of graduation from seminary, and given the pace of change in modern society, it was difficult to list issues that would have been equally important (or perhaps manifestly important at all) for some of the men during the time they were in seminary. Nevertheless, several issues which are clearly of more recent vintage were included with the belief that, in spite of their contemporaneity, there was the possibility that earlier seminary training would be perceived to have been to some degree relevant and helpful.

---

[13] This may indeed be the case, if my rather superficial observation of some current developments is accurate. It seems quite frequently to be small denominational seminaries, either relatively young schools or those which were traditionally of the Vocational School or Religious Community types, which seem to be doing a great deal of innovating (with curricula, with field education, etc.). This may be the result of a fight for survival which frees these schools from being bound by traditional practices more so than more prestigious schools which are perhaps tradition-bound to a greater extent.

In general, it was expected that the Religious Community and Vocational Schools would receive a high proportion of "helpful" responses on the item relating to the minister's role in the local church; however, on the various social issues items, it was expected that the Graduate School model would be higher in the "helpful" category. These expectations proved generally to be correct, as

---

[14] I must confess that the choice of issues included in the list clearly reflects my own biases towards the social dimensions of ministry. Perhaps too many of the variety of ministerial role expectations were summed up in the "minister's role in the local church" item. Nevertheless, not only are the other issues listed crucial ones for modern society, about which ministers and others are often called on for opinions and action, but these issues ought to discriminate between the various types of schools.

TABLE 24

HELPFULNESS OF SEMINARY FOR VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE MINISTER'S ROLE AND UNDERSTANDING BY SEMINARY TYPE

	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
1. In Local Church			
Helpful	68.9	66.4	52.0
Somewhat Helpful	17.5	14.4	24.0
Not Helpful	13.5	19.1	24.0
N =	(834)	(188)	(421)
2. In Local Social, Political and Economic Structures			
Helpful	10.9	26.2	32.4
Somewhat Helpful	20.1	26.7	23.6
Not Helpful	68.9	47.1	44.0
N =	(834)	(187)	(420)
3. In Issues Relating to Civil Rights and Minority Groups			
Helpful	11.4	26.7	39.3
Somewhat Helpful	21.5	27.7	18.3
Not Helpful	67.1	45.5	42.4
N =	(832)	(191)	(420)
4. In Issues Confronting Urban Areas			
Helpful	13.6	20.3	32.2
Somewhat Helpful	23.1	20.9	21.7
Not Helpful	63.3	58.8	46.1
N =	(832)	(187)	(423)

(Table 24 Continued)

	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
5. In Problems of Automation and Technology			
Helpful	6.5	9.0	17.9
Somewhat Helpful	14.3	18.6	20.2
Not Helpful	79.2	72.3	61.9
N =	(830)	(188)	(420)
6. Issues Relating to International Relations			
Helpful	9.6	19.9	24.9
Somewhat Helpful	18.9	28.8	22.1
Not Helpful	71.5	51.3	53.0
N =	(831)	(19.)	(421)

can be seen from the various sub-tables of Table 24. The Religious Community and Vocational Schools have the highest proportions in the "helpful" category concerning preparation for local church ministry. In all other areas--those dealing with the various types of social issues--the Graduate School type is more helpful on these issues than the other two types as was expected. The Religious Community model is least helpful. Significantly, however, none of the percentages in the "helpful" categories is particularly high in comparison with the "helpful" category on the local church question. This suggests that Liston Pope's judgment, expressed in the early

1940's, is still to some extent applicable. In his classic Millhands and Preachers, Pope asserted that the "social quiescence" of the churches in Gastonia could be blamed partially on the lack of knowledge of ministers concerning social and economic matters and a corresponding uncritical adoption of the values at hand.[15] Several respondents indicated in written comments that this, in fact, was the case. A 1960 Vocational School graduate wrote:

> You can tell my disappointment in my seminary training. It did not even attempt to help me to be an interpreter to "my people" of the world we are now confronting. Any growth in "social conscience" has taken place since seminary--in spite of it, not because of it.

Considering the rapidly changing world in which we live, however, it may be quite unrealistic and unfair to expect that seminary education prepares men by providing them with depth insight into a variety of social issues. Much of this is properly the function of undergraduate education. What does seem important--and here I am anticipating later discussion--is that theological schools help their students to develop a methodology for dealing with social issues that might arise in the future, and, in addition, supplement this with opportunities for continuing education. That some seminaries have done this is reflected in several other comments. As one man--also a Vocational School graduate--expressed it, "While I do not feel that my seminary training prepared me for the radical nature of my present approach to the ministry, it gave me the openness to move out in new directions."

---

[15] Millhands and Preachers (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942), p. 181.

III. OTHER CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEMINARY TYPES

Having considered the three types of schools from the point of view of characteristics of their graduates, and from reports of the graduates concerning aspects of the school, I now turn to the third kind of data regarding the three types--that which is derived from catalogues and from the Directory of Theological Schools.

The first comparison to be considered is that of the distribution of the curriculum over various substantive areas of theological education. The data were derived from content analysis of the catalogues of the seminaries.[16] It was thought that the distributions might differ significantly--at least for some areas--according to types of schools. Actually, as Table 25 makes evident, the

---

[16] This is a poor measure for a number of reasons, not least of which is the notoriety of catalogues of educational institutions in listing courses that are rarely if ever offered. There are probably several reasons for this. It "looks good" to have so many courses listed. Furthermore, given the considerable work that often goes into getting courses approved for inclusion in the curriculum, it is understandable, perhaps, why they are listed year after year, whether they are currently offered or not. At any rate, the plethora of courses often listed which are no longer offered make the catalogue curriculum listing a poor source of data. (One seminary--not in this study--lists 16 courses as being offered by one faculty member!) A more accurate measure would probably be the annual listing of courses actually offered. Earlier studies have used required courses in a similar fashion; however, moves in recent years to free curricula by many schools make this measure inapplicable.

TABLE 25

CURRICULUM OFFERINGS IN VARIOUS AREAS BY TYPE OF SEMINARY

	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
Biblical	28.9	29.6	25.7
Historical	14.6	13.0	14.3
Theological/Philosophical	16.0	14.2	14.5
Ethics and Society	7.3	8.3	9.2
Religion and Culture	0.6	1.2	2.5
Missions/World Religions	4.9	5.5	4.4
Pastoral Care/Psychology of Religion	4.8	5.8	6.1
Church Administration/Pastoral Theology	3.3	2.2	5.4
Christian Education	9.0	9.3	9.1
Homiletics and Liturgics	10.6	10.8	8.8
N =	(1236)	(675)	(1245)

differences seem relatively insignificant in a substantive sense, in spite of a statistically significant chi square ($p < .001$). The surprising aspect of the table, considering the large N based on courses listed by the 21 seminaries, is the homogeneity rather heterogeneity of the three types! It should be recalled, however, that this homogeneity is that of the distribution of the percentage of courses offered--a quantitative measure--and not of the quality of the courses and instruction, nor of the course content. Although the distribution is important as an indication of what and how much is offered, in last analysis, the quality of the offerings in relation to the aims of professional theological education is considerably more important. Furthermore, the quality of instruction in professional education--and this perhaps is a normative judgment--depends to a considerable extent on the degree to which it integrates theory and practice, including a relation of theory to the context in which professional practice occurs. I will return to a consideration of this matter in the concluding chapter.

One further comment should be made regarding the similarity of the distribution of courses in the curriculum. It is clear that for all seminary types, courses relating to the Mastery of the Tradition (Bible, history, theology) constitute well over 50% of the course listings. Courses relating to Practical Competence (pastoral care, Christian education, homiletics and liturgics, church administration) account for another 25 to 30%, with the remainder distributed among various courses relating to the goal of Secular Awareness.[17] Some would perhaps agree that this distribution is adequate, especially if the concern for quality is met.[18] Others argue for more attention to contemporary concerns, or at least for the continual relating of tradition to contemporary existence. Writes Charles Feilding:

---

[17] In light of my previous comments about overcoming the distinctions between practical and theoretical and secular and spiritual, I would hope that these distinctions with reference to course distributions are administrative rather than pedagogical; that is, I would hope that courses in practical areas were pedagogically integrated with theological and other issues, and vice versa, and that distinctions between practical and theoretical or spiritual and secular were chiefly for administrative purposes. I doubt seriously, however, if this is the case.

> An excessive proportion of time devoted to biblical studies appears to be a reaction in some schools to an earlier trade school approach to the ministry from which serious critical historical and theological study of the Bible had been excluded. In other schools it is perhaps related to the older fundamentalism or its more scholarly successors. In either case, the student's understanding of the world he lives in and must communicate with is jeopardized by the imbalance . . . .[19]

Whoever is right--and I tend to agree with Feilding--it is evident from the overall distributions of Table 25 that, in terms of sheer magnitude, the Mastery of the Tradition emphasis considerably overshadows all the others.

A second set of comparisons based on institutional data derived from catalogues and directories forms the basis of what may be called an index of institutional quality. Institutional quality, like the previous discussion of the curriculum, is a subtle and probably finally non-quantifiable dimension. Nevertheless, relatively crude measures which are more or less discriminating are regularly used to judge educational and other institutions.

---

[18] See the discussion by Peter Berger, "Religious Establishment and Theological Education," Theology Today, XIX (July, 1962), pp. 178-191. Berger argues for more, not less, emphasis on the traditional biblical and theological disciplines as those disciplines which constitute the core of what the minister as a professional has to profess.

[19] Education For Ministry, op. cit., p. 28.

Accrediting agencies use a number of measures, many of which are quantifiable, as a basis for judging whether or not a school is worthy of accreditation. Likewise, in a study concerned with academic freedom, Lazarsfeld and Thielens constructed a "quality index" for colleges and universities based on a number of readily quantifiable measures.[20] I have followed Lazarsfeld and Thielens' example in constructing the index used in this study; however, some of the dimensions utilized by them in their index are either inappropriate or unavailable (e.g., tuition fee and expenditure per student). The index was constructed by assigning a score to each seminary on each of the following items: faculty-student ratio; size of library (number of books); number of books per student; number of periodicals in the library; number of periodicals per student; and proportion of faculty with earned doctorates (See Appendix C). It will be immediately obvious that this is a crude index, and that much that makes for institutional quality has been omitted. Nevertheless, these were quantitative aspects of the schools readily accessible and they are in one way or another associated with the quality of an educational institution. Furthermore, and, perhaps, more important, they prove rather discriminating when schools are compared on the overall index as well as item by item. Table 26 summarizes the findings, first for the overall quality index by type of seminary, followed in Table 27 by a comparison of the three types on each of the items used to construct the index.[21]

---

[20] Paul F. Lazarsfeld, and Wagner Thielens, Jr., The Academic Mind (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 411-414.

TABLE 26

INDEX OF INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY BY SEMINARY TYPE

Index of Institutional Quality	Seminary Type: Religious Community N = 9 %	Vocational School N = 4 %	Graduate School N = 8 %
Low	55.6	50.0	12.5
Medium	44.4	50.0	37.5
High	-	-	50.0

It was expected, on the basis of the historical analysis, that both the Religious Community and Vocational School models would be lower on the quality index than the Graduate School seminaries. The Religious Community was expected to be slightly higher in quality than the Vocational School. The first of these expectations is clearly confirmed. For example, only Graduate School types fall

---

[21] It should be noted that, in this table and several following, the N refers to the number of seminaries in the sample, and it is quite small (21). If these seminaries constituted the total population of seminaries, there would be no problem. However, since they do not constitute the total population, and since the number is quite small, the findings in the table may have occurred as the result of sampling fluctuations. This cannot be ruled out, and the reader should be forewarned; nevertheless, the relative consistency of the various findings with anticipated relationships gives some legitimacy to the findings at least for these seminaries.

TABLE 27

VARIABLES USED TO CONSTRUCT QUALITY INDEX BY SEMINARY TYPE

	Seminary Type		
	Religious Community % N = 9	Vocational School % N = 4	Graduate School % N = 8
1. Faculty/Student Ratio (Full-time Faculty to B.D. Students)			
(Large) 14-16	22.2	25.0	-
11-13	33.3	25.0	-
10	11.1	-	25.0
8-9	22.2	25.0	25.0
(Small) 5-7	11.1	25.0	50.0
2. Size of Library (Number of volumes)			
Under 75,000	44.4	-	12.5
75,000-100,000	11.1	75.0	12.5
101,000-150,000	11.1	-	37.5
151,000-200,000	22.2	25.0	12.5
Over 200,000	11.1	-	25.0
3. Books Per Student			
Under 300	44.4	25.0	-
300-500	11.1	25.0	12.5
501-600	-	50.0	25.0
601-900	33.3	-	12.5
Over 900	11.1	-	50.0
4. Number of Periodicals in Library			
Under 300	33.3	50.0	12.5
300-399	44.4	-	12.5
400-499	11.1	25.0	25.0
500-599	-	-	37.5
Over 600	11.1	25.0	12.5

(Table 27 continued)

	Seminary Type		
	Religious Community	Vocational School	Graduate School
	%	%	%
	N = 9	N = 4	N = 8
5. Periodicals Per Student			
0.5-1.0	44.4	25.0	-
1.1-1.7	22.2	50.0	12.5
1.8-2.3	22.2	-	50.0
Over 2.3	11.1	25.0	37.5
6. Proportion of Faculty with Earned Doctorates			
Under .60	66.6	25.0	12.5
.60-.79	11.1	25.0	62.5
Over .79	22.2	50.0	25.0

into the high quality category. However, the Vocational School seminaries are slightly higher in quality than the Religious Community schools rather than the reverse. The difference, nevertheless, is considerably small.

When the various measures which were used to construct the quality index are examined individually according to seminary type, the same general pattern as found above occurs. In most comparisons, the Graduate School occupies the most favorable position of the three types. The Vocational School occupies a middle position, and the Religious Community is generally in the lowest or least favorable comparative position.

While most of these individual measures reported in Table 27 are rather obvious in their implications, the faculty-student ratio deserves special comment. It is important for several reasons, but perhaps most of all as one indication of the interaction pattern (actual or potential) of an institution. As Wheeler points out:

> Student-faculty ratios, like inmate-staff ratios, give some indication of the opportunity for meaningful interchange between socializing agent and recruit. Both developmental and resocialization organizations pride themselves on achieving low ratios of recruits to agents, for a low ratio makes possible, at least theoretically, a greater impact of agent on recruit.[22]

As Wheeler recognizes, low faculty-student ratios imply not only smaller classes and more possibility of interaction in the classroom; they also imply, again theoretically, more possibility of interaction outside the classroom. That is, the faculty member with small classes is, at least in principle, freer to spend time interacting with his students on an individual or more informal basis. As the Niebuhr, Williams, Gustafson study indicated,

> A common complaint of students in larger seminaries is that "the faculty members are inaccessible," or that "we don't get to know the faculty as persons." Students recognize some of the demands made upon faculty time and generally accept the inaccessibility that exists as their fate.[23]

Given these comments regarding the importance of faculty-student ratios, it is interesting to examine the comparisons in the first sub-table of Table 27. Since the N is so small on which the percentages are computed, it helps to collapse the different ratios into two groups: schools with ratios of ten to sixteen students per faculty member, and those with ratios ranging from five to nine. When this grouping is done mentally for the table, it can be seen that two thirds of the Religious Community schools fall into the larger ratio category, while all of the Graduate School seminaries have low faculty-student ratios. The Vocational School seminaries are evenly divided. Clearly, as a measure of interaction _potential_ (if not actual interaction), the faculty-student ratios suggest that the Graduate School seminaries differ considerably from the other two types.

---

[22] Socialization Through the Life Cycle, op. cit., p. 74.

[23] The Advancement of Theological Education, p. 106.

Interpersonal interaction with the faculty is not the only kind of interaction important for socialization. In fact, if some studies are correct in their findings, student-faculty contacts are probably less significant than interaction with peers.[24] While it is obvious that peer influences on socialization may subvert the official formal goals of the agents of socialization, let us not consider this possibility for the moment, but rather assume that the seminary wishes to enhance the interaction among students as well as with faculty. There are, perhaps, several ways to accomplish this, and one way is through manipulation of ecological arrangements.

---

[24] See the previously cited essay by Wilson. "The Entering Student: Attributes and Agents of Change," _College Peer Groups_, _op_. _cit_., pp. 85-87.

Ecological segregation--for example, such as that attempted by the traditional Roman Catholic pattern of theological education and to some extent by Protestant denominations in locating their colleges and seminaries in small communities--is one way to accomplish this. This will concern us below; however, another way to influence and enhance interaction ecologically is, quite simply and obviously, through the provision of on-campus housing. Rates of friendship formation and rates of interaction are highly correlated with housing arrangements.[25]

Along with the importance of on-campus housing for enhancing interaction is also its potential importance for the organization's exercise of control over its members. Etzioni has referred to this as the scope of an organization, that is, the number of activities carried out jointly by the same set of participants.[26] In general, the greater the scope in organizations whose goal is socialization, especially of a relatively primary nature, the more effective the socialization.

For these reasons--the concern with interaction potential and organizational scope, which are related but different concerns--it seemed important to compare the three types of schools as to their housing patterns. Do most students live on campus or off campus? Such a simple distinction is much too crude a measure, either of interaction patterns or of scope; nevertheless, given the nature of the sample and the need of using survey research techniques, a crude index had to be settled for. Each respondent was asked to indicate in which of several possible kinds of housing he lived during the majority of his seminary career. The answers were then grouped into on campus and off campus, and the modal type was ascertained for each seminary.

---

[25] See Leon Festinger, et al., Social Pressures in Informal Groups (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950).

[26] See Amitai Etzioni, "Organizational Control Structure," Handbook of Organizations, op. cit., pp. 650-674.

Historical and theoretical considerations led me to predict that a greater proportion of seminaries of the Religious Community model would have on-campus housing as their modal living pattern, and, therefore, have high scope. On the other hand, the Vocational School type, with its trade school connotations, was expected to have the smallest proportion of seminaries with on-campus housing as modal. Table 28 reports the findings. While the small N, especially for the Vocational School, makes interpretation somewhat difficult and tenuous, there does seem to be slight support for the hypothesis.[27]

Finally, there is one other set of comparisons that should be presented for each of the seminary types. This set is closely

---

[27] In subsequent chapters, the respondent's housing during seminary rather than the modal category for the seminary will be used as a control variable when the relation between social climates and socialization outcomes are analyzed.

TABLE 28

PERCENTAGES OF SEMINARIES HAVING ON OR OFF CAMPUS HOUSING AS THE MODAL HOUSING FOR THEIR GRADUATES BY TYPE OF SEMINARY

	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
Off Campus (Low Scope)	44.4	75.0	50.0
On Campus (High Scope)	55.5	25.0	50.0
N =	(9)	(4)	(8)

related to the discussion above in that it also concerns the ecology of the seminaries. Two of the most widely discussed attributes of seminaries of recent years have been their institutional relationship (or lack of it) and their urban location (or lack of it). These attributes have become, as one theological educator has put it, a part of the "orthodoxy" of theological education.[28]

It is clear from the previous historical sketch that some denominations historically sought to avoid the ecological settings of the city and the university, both of which were thought to be distracting and unwholesome environments for optimal theological education. But today, in general, the educational philosophy has changed. The urbanization of American society and the knowledge explosion in all areas of learning, to mention but two of the important changes that have affected modern society, make it somewhat dysfunctional and anachronistic, to say the least, for professionals, who will serve in a complex, urban society, to be trained in a rural or small town setting, isolated from both urban and secular university contacts. President Nathan Pusey of Harvard University expressed this dilemma as follows:

---

[28] Roy Pearson, "Trouble in the Seminaries," The Christian Century LXXV (April 24, 1968), pp. 512-515. The "orthodoxy" implies that if a seminary has both an urban location and a university relationship, it is twice blessed. If it has only one of these ecological attributes, then it is less than a whole seminary. But, most of all, pity the poor seminary which, because of the lack of foresight of its denominational founders and lack of funds to relocate, has to exist in a non-urban setting with no university relationship.

> The older seminary, set apart by design, has tended to remain apart. Students have begun to feel these seminaries are not where the world is, either in location or thought. Their methods are antiquated, their concern circumscribed. The present generation of students--at least the more vocal or activist among them--no longer incline to accept this. They maintain that they are not opposed to scholarship, a proper traditional concern of strong seminaries, but they want a relevant and vital scholarship. The seminary's scholarship they say is timid, remote and unreal--even at its best peripheral and unconcerned with essential considerations. It has almost nothing to say about the contemporary world. One has to turn to secular scholarship for this. Secular learning, they assert, cares about people, cares about them where they are, speaks to them there. Why cannot seminary learning do something of the kind? Why must it go on preparing young men and women for a world that does not exist--or at best an outmoded world that is no longer the real world at society's growing edge; for a world not peopled by a confused and struggling humanity?[29]

In response to this dilemma, there is an increasing concern (and some implementation of the concern) to shift seminaries, both Protestant and Catholic alike, into an urban, university context in ecumenical clusters, such as at Berkeley and Boston, to mention but two.[30]

---

[29] "Culture, Education and the Church," Humanity, III (December, 1966), p. 4.

These latter developments are relatively recent, and they have not yet affected a large number of seminaries. Therefore, it was assumed that historical ecological patterns would still be in evidence among the seminaries of the sample. If there is any relationship of the types of the study to the historical antecedents of these types, then the Religious Community model would be expected to be most likely to be located in rural or small town settings, and least likely to be related to a university. On the other hand, the opposite would be expected for the Graduate School model, with the Vocational School more nearly like the former than the latter.

Actually, when urban location is considered, the comparisons are quite difficult to make. In the basically urban society of the United States what constitutes an urban location? Only one of the twenty-one seminaries is not located in what the U.S. Census classifies as a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA),[31] and that, true to expectation, is a Religious Community seminary. Even when a criterion of location in a city of 500,000 or above is applied, roughly 50% of each type of seminary is included. Those percentages go to 75% for the Religious Community and Vocational Schools, and 62.5% of the Graduate School when all cities above 250,000 are included, and two other seminaries (one Religious Community and one Graduate School) are located within the New York-Philadelphia megalopolis. Therefore, it seems that, although historically, some denominations might have attempted to locate seminaries apart from urban areas, it is not possible for many seminaries today to escape the realities of urban life if physical proximity is taken as an indicator. It may be, however, that physical proximity to urban areas is not really the basic factor. But, before exploring this further, the tabulations for relation to educational institutions should be considered.

---

[30] See Edward B. Fiske, "Seminaries Are Going Secular," The New York Times, Section E, January 29, 1967, p. 7.

[31] Defined as "a county or group of contiguous counties which contain at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more or 'twin cities' with a combined population of at least 50,000." U.S. Bureau

Seminaries were classified as related to another educational institution if they indicated either an organic relation (e.g., as a professional school of a university) or an unofficial but reciprocal relation, although the schools were organically distinct. All others were classified as not related. As it can be seen by inspecting Table 29, the percentage distribution indicates a strong association

---

of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1960, Number of Inhabitants, United States Summary. Final Report DC(1)-A. (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961), p. XXIV.

between institutional relation and seminary type in the predicted direction. Therefore, although the urban/non-urban comparisons proved unfruitful, this was not the case for institutional relationship.

TABLE 29

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS BY SEMINARY TYPE

Relationship	Religious Community %	Vocational School %	Graduate School %
No official or reciprocal relation	63.3	50.0	12.5
Official or reciprocal relation	33.3	50.0	87.5
N =	(9)	(4)	(8)

What might be the benefits of being related to another educational institution? As the previous discussion has made clear, especially the quotation from President Pusey, an important fruit of being related to a university is the opportunity provided for engagement with other disciplines, including those dealing with crucial areas affecting contemporary life. While it is obvious that this is only one possible benefit, it is an important one, and it might be expected to have some bearing on increasing the seminary student's breadth of understanding of various contemporary issues. To test this, the previously discussed questions, in which students had been asked to indicate the degree of helpfulness of their seminary education in understanding certain areas and issues, were cross-tabulated by the institutional relation of their seminary, controlling for seminary type. Table 30 contains the findings.[32]

To my considerable surprise, the findings, with only a very few exceptions, did not support my expectations. That is, in the majority of cases there is either no relation between institutional relation and indicating that the seminary preparation was helpful, or there is a negative relation, regardless of seminary type. In the case of the Graduate School type in particular, there were several strongly negative relationships between institutional relation and helpful preparation. Only for two comparisons (international affairs in the Religious Community and urban issues in the Vocational School) did a moderate relation exist. Before commenting any further on these findings, let me repeat: these comparisons deal with only one possible benefit which association with a university or other educational institution might have for a seminary student. Therefore, the negative findings cannot be taken in any sense as disproof of positive benefits of being related to a university. Nevertheless, the several relationships, especially

---

[32] To assess the strength of relationship in these comparisons, I have computed the gamma measure of association. The measure can vary between -1 and +1. Gammas between -.20 and +.20 are, as a rule of thumb, considered weak; those between -.45 to -.21 and between +.21 to +.45 are considered moderate in size; and those below -.45 and above +.45 are considered strong. For further discussion of the gamma measure, see Leo A. Goodman and William H. Kruskal, "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," Journal of the American Statistical Association, XLIX (December, 1954), pp. 747-754.

TABLE 30

DEGREE OF HELPFULNESS OF SEMINARY EDUCATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND INSTITUTIONAL RELATION (* = SUB-TABLE SIGNIFICANT AT .05)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	Institutional Relation					
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	%	%	%	%	%	%
1. Minister's role in the local church						
Helpful	73.0	60.1*	75.9	68.2*	51.7	52.1
Somewhat Helpful	16.5	18.9	3.8	19.2	24.1	24.0
Not Helpful	10.5	21.0	20.3	12.6	24.1	24.0
N =	(522)	(243)	(79)	(198)	(58)	(363)
Gamma =	.28		.10		-.01	
2. Minister's role in local social, political and economic structures						
Helpful	10.1	12.8	26.2	19.4*	51.7	29.3*
Somewhat Helpful	19.3	21.9	16.2	30.6	24.1	23.5
Not Helpful	70.6	65.3	57.5	50.0	24.1	47.2
N =	(523)	(242)	(80)	(196)	(58)	(362)
Gamma =	-.11		-.04		.41	
3. Issues relating to civil rights and minority groups						
Helpful	9.6	14.5	22.5	20.5	62.1	35.6*
Somewhat Helpful	21.7	21.5	25.0	25.5	20.7	18.0
Not Helpful	68.7	64.0	52.5	54.0	17.2	46.4
N =	(521)	(242)	(80)	(200)	(58)	(362)
Gamma =	-.12		.04		.50	

TABLE 30 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	Institutional Relation					
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	%	%	%	%	%	%
4. Issues confronting urban areas						
Helpful	11.9	14.5	12.5	17.4	56.9	28.2*
Somewhat Helpful	22.8	24.4	18.7	25.6	13.8	23.0
Not Helpful	65.3	61.2	68.7	56.9	29.3	48.8
N =	(521)	(242)	(80)	(195)	(58)	(365)
Gamma =	-.09		-.22		.43	
5. Problems of automation and technology						
Helpful	7.3	5.4	10.0	5.6	24.1	16.9
Somewhat Helpful	14.2	14.5	17.5	15.7	27.6	19.1
Not Helpful	78.5	80.1	72.5	78.7	48.3	64.1
N =	(520)	(241)	(80)	(197)	(58)	(362)
Gamma =	.06		.17		.26	
6. Issues relating to international relations						
Helpful	6.9	14.9*	30.0	12.5*	51.7	20.7*
Somewhat Helpful	16.9	22.7	21.2	29.5	19.0	22.6
Not Helpful	76.2	62.4	48.7	58.0	29.3	56.7
N =	(521)	(242)	(80)	(200)	(58)	(363)
Gamma =	-.31		.25		.52	

concerning the Graduate School model, are extremely interesting and cause one to stop and think before too quickly asserting that a university relation, like an urban location, is a _sine qua non_ of contemporary theological education.[33]

This leads to a summary reflection on both aspects of the location of the schools that have been considered. It may well be--and I am personally convinced that it is--that urban location and relation to a university are important only to the extent that the definition of the situation by the dominant agents of socialization permits them to be. It is not the ecological setting by itself, but the prevailing system of values and norms, that is, in last analysis, decisive. Without the physical setting of an urban location and a university context, there would be no possibility of benefiting from these ecological arrangements. However, unless participation in and learning from these contexts is legitimated and positively sanctioned, then it is unlikely that there will be much benefit.[34]

---

[33] It may be that this desire for a university relationship is partly a recognition that such a relationship is important for legitimation of a once prestigious profession that has declined in status. As is well known, new or marginal professions seek a university affiliation, since the "better" professional schools are university-affiliated. See Barber, "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," _op. cit._, pp. 674, 678.

[34] Berger and Luckmann, _The Social Construction of Reality_, _op. cit._, pp. 114-116, have a nice term for what is implied. They speak of _nihilation_ as a type of negative legitimation, which seeks either to account for or liquidate conceptually everything outside of one's

So many comparisons have been made between the three types of schools that it would be too long and involved to attempt to summarize the findings. Perhaps it will suffice to say that most of the comparisons, whether aggregated personal characteristics of the respondents, data using the graduates as informants, or data derived from catalogues and directories, tend to support the expectations regarding the three types of seminaries which theoretical and historical considerations suggest. These various comparisons go considerably far, I suggest, towards establishing the validity of the types as constructs. Furthermore, as was also the case with the consideration of personal philosophies of theological education, the kinds of comparisons which were made in this chapter will help to make sense of some of the findings to be reported in the following three chapters. Not all of the variables considered above will be used as control variables to interpret the relation between social climates and socialization outcomes; however, recalling some of the differences which have been found will, at least inferentially, be of possible interpretative significance.

The important question now is that of the predictive validity of the three types of schools. What possible difference, if any, does it make in a minister's theological orientation, in his social-

---

world-view, which, in this case, would include the benefits of an urban or university relationship. Some urban and university-related seminaries may benefit not at all from their ecological setting because they nihilate it, in Berger and Luckmann's terms.

ethical perspective, and in his image of ministry, that he attended one type of school rather than the other?

CHAPTER VII

SOCIAL CLIMATE AND THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION

> The medical student at his rounds or the Ph.D. candidate in English is not necessarily concerned with the quest for personal faith. But the book ends on the desk of the seminarian include a Commentary on Galatians _and_ the usual "Guide to Thesis Writing." The quest for a fuller faith is not carried on in a state of controlled schizophrenia, neatly dividing faith from study. Seminary is a time when honest faith and honest doubt are inseparable. It is also a time when acute self-consciousness about such matters reaches its height. How much easier it would be if the student could _simply_ study the German Reformation or the Oxford Movement or Baillee's Christology without any concern for personal involvement in the problems raised. It cannot be.
>
> -- Walter D. Wagoner[1]

In earlier chapters of this study, I followed Merton and his colleagues in their suggestion that the development of "the professional self with its characteristic values, attitudes, knowledge and skills" is the primary goal of socialization into a profession. This, I suggested, is a summary term, catching up, as it were, several different dimensions of the outcomes of professional socialization which vary from profession to profession. For the minister, the major dimensions of the "professional self" or "point of view" include at least the following: theological orientation, social ethical perspective, and image of the ministry. In this chapter and the next two, I shall consider each of these three dimensions of the professional self in succession. The question of interest, as I have already indicated, is the function of the seminary itself, as an agency of socialization, in shaping each of these dimensions of the point of view. To attempt to ascertain this, the structural effects analysis discussed in Chapter Four will be utilized. In addition, a number of other variables will be introduced as control variables to test for spuriousness or to interpret the relationship between social climates and the dependent variables.

---

[1] _Bachelor of Divinity_ (New York: Association Press, 1963), p. 73.

I also indicated in preceding chapters that it is a plausible assumption that the various aspects of the professional self are positively correlated and form a clearly distinguishable, consistent "professional self."[2] That is, theological liberalism might be expected to be positively correlated with a contextual ethical perspective and liberal attitudes on various social-ethical issues. Furthermore, for reasons that will become more clear below, I also suspect a positive correlation to exist between theological liberalism, contextual ethics, and an instrumental or "doing" image of the ministry. This assumption of consistency is not a major concern of this study, as interesting and important as it is in its own right.

---

[2] This would appear to be the case if, for example, Parsons and Smelser are correct in assuming that one's basic value orientation (in this case, the minister's basic theological orientation) can be considered as the highest component in a cybernetic hierarchy, setting limits upon the variability of the lower-order components of action. See Talcott Parsons, "An Outline of the Social System," Theories of Society, eds. Talcott Parsons, et al. (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961)-I, pp. 37-41; and Neil J. Smelser, Theory of Collective Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 23-46.

I hope, nevertheless, to shed some light on the issue, at least by examining the correlations between the various scales used to measure aspects of the "professional self." For this reason, I have computed product-moment correlations between each of the scales measured in the research.[3] The correlations will be noted at various appropriate places within the ensuing chapters. To repeat, however, the primary concern is with the structural effects of the seminary types on the various aspects of the "professional self" rather than with the consistency of these aspects.

I. THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS: MEANING AND MEASUREMENT

The first aspect of the professional self to be considered is that of theological orientation. As I indicated in Chapter One, a minister's theological orientation is a part of the "esoteric" knowledge base which is one distinctive mark of a professional occupation, and which is a source of the professional's authority _vis à vis_ the lay public.[4] The theological seminary, as the name indicates, is to a considerable degree concerned to enable the student to know the theological heritage, past and present, of the Judaeo-Christian tradition as well as the heritage of specific denominational or confessional traditions. In addition--and quite important--many theological educators are deeply concerned that the student develop skill in "doing theology," that is, skill in doing his own theological reflection as he brings together the resources of scripture and tradition with the contemporary situation. It is not enough that the minister know that St. Augustine said this and Luther that, or that more recently the followers of Karl Barth and the followers of Paul Tillich have failed to agree on a number of basic theological issues, or that the most current developments in theological circles have to do with a "theology of hope." Rather, such understanding, it is hoped, will become the basis for the interpretation of issues in contemporary life which the minister communicates through his preaching and teaching roles.

---

[3] While this statistic assumes a level of measurement which these scales probably do not meet, the correlation coefficient can be legitimately used, as Hays points out, as a _descriptive_ statistic for relationships that exist _within_ these data. The coefficient cannot be used to generalize beyond the sample to some larger population. See William L. Hays, _Statistics for Psychologists_, _op. cit._, pp. 509-510.

[4] See Talcott Parsons, _Essays in Sociological Theory_, revised edition (New York: The Free Press, 1954), p. 38.

It is obvious that much of this theological expertise lies at the cognitive level, as is the case for other professions as well. Nevertheless, as the quotation from Walter Wagoner which stands at the beginning of this chapter indicates, a minister's theological orientation has dimensions other than the cognitive. There are existential dimensions as well. Theology is not only that body of knowledge about which the minister has some professional expertise. It also has to do intimately with that in which the minister believes and is committed to in an ultimate sense, or, in James Gustafson's words, with "what a man believes and trusts in as the basis of his own coherence and integrity."[5] It is with the latter aspect of theology--its existential dimension--that I am primarily concerned in this section.

It is not that cognitive knowledge about theology, the Christian heritage, the Bible, etc. is unrelated to one's theological orientation in the existential sense. Obviously one has some degree of relation to the other. For example, to know about, if only in a cognitive sense, what is being written and said by those who are concerned with form criticism, or with biblical hermeneutics, or with the implications of linguistic analysis for theological language, or with the "death of God" controversy, is to have some rather searching questions raised about one's existential theology. As Wagoner says, "Unless one is a fundamentalist or an ultrapietist, it is impossible neatly to separate the God to whom one prays and the God about whom one reasons."[6] Even these types of persons have problems. I recall an extremely conservative graduate student in religion who would take a hymnal, go to the woods, and sing hymns as loudly as he could to maintain his faith in the face of the textual criticism he was doing for his doctoral dissertation in biblical studies. Another fundamentalist student (who was a straight A student) solved his dilemma--at least symbolically--by ceremonially burning the notes he had taken in classes which he considered to be heretical. Nevertheless, in spite of the close relationship between what I am calling the cognitive and existential dimensions of one's theological orientation, the two are not the same and should be kept separate.[7]

---

[5] "Theological Education as Professional Education," p. 245.

[6] _Bachelor_ _of_ _Divinity_, _op_. _cit_., p. 72.

If then, the concern here is with the existential dimensions of one's theological orientation, especially as this orientation is influenced by the social climate or model of theological education, what is the best way of conceptualizing and measuring theological orientations? There is no easy answer to this question. Perhaps one of the greatest sources of difficulty lies in the considerable flux and ferment in which contemporary theology finds itself. This is not the place to consider this ferment either with regard to its root causes or its manifestations and trends.[8] While the ferment and flux are most evident among the professional theologians whose doubts, affirmations and new directions of thought are publicly available in their writings, it would be a serious mistake to think that this ferment has not affected both clergy and laity, and especially the former. Reporting on a survey of 3,000 ministers conducted by a popular woman's magazine, the author concluded:

---

[7] Glock and Stark have recognized this difference in their discussion of the dimensions of religiosity. They make a distinction between religious belief (the ideological dimension) and religious knowledge (the intellectual dimension), and suggest that the two may vary independently. Charles Glock and Rodney Stark, _Religion and Society in Tension_ (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965), pp. 18-38.

[8] See, for example, Michael Novak, "The New Relativism in American Theology," _The Religious Situation: 1968_, ed. Donald Cutler (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968), pp. 197-231. See also, Peter L. Berger, "A Sociological View of the Secularization of Theology," _Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion_, VI (Spring, 1967), pp. 3-16, and Jackson W. Carroll, "Some Insights into Historicity From the Perspective of Sociology," unpublished mimeographed paper, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia, 1969.

> The world of theology, as it emerges from these 3,000 intensely candid letters, is open, fluid, changing--almost surely greatly different from what it would have been if the same questionnaire had gone out to ministers fifty years ago or even twenty-five; and one has little sense of a passing phenomenon, a fad, a change that will blow away.[9]

The recent work by Jeffrey Hadden, based on some of the same data used in this study, has also documented the diversity of belief among ministers and laymen alike.[10] This ferment and flux creates considerable difficulty for conceptualizing and measuring theological orientations in a meaningful way.

One possibility would have been to use, as Hadden did in the study just cited, discrete belief statements on which respondents are compared. This has the advantage of allowing for a diversity of specific doctrinal issues to be examined one by one. However, for some purposes, an attitude or belief scale, representing a combination of a number of individual doctrinal or attitudinal statements, is more adequate and less susceptible to idiosyncratic responses on single items. This is especially true when one is interested in the general attitudinal set of individuals rather than their opinions on specific topics or ideas. Furthermore, a combined set of belief or attitudinal items, which purportedly measure a single underlying attitude, allows one to differentiate individuals more precisely regarding their degree of agreement or disagreement with the expressed attitude.[11] Since my concern was to measure basic theological orientations, rather than agreement or disagreement with specific doctrinal items, it seemed necessary to utilize a scale consisting of a number of items which were tested and found to be discriminating. The details concerning the items used and the method of item selection and analysis are included in Appendix C.

---

[9] Ardis Whitman, "The View From the Pulpit," McCall's, (February, 1968), p. 149.

[10] Hadden, The Gathering Storm. See also Glock and Stark, Religion and Society in Tension, op. cit., pp. 86-122.

The previously mentioned ferment and flux in contemporary theology, plus the complexity of theology in general, make it rather difficult to define any one dimension general enough to make meaningful distinctions between types of theological orientation.[12] As I indicated in Chapter One, a less than totally satisfactory resolution was finally made by choosing the quite general, nebulous, and overworked categories of conservative and liberal as defining the continuum on which theological orientations would be measured. While the actual items used are listed in Appendix C, the working definitions given to conservatism and liberalism are as follows. A high degree of conservatism is defined as involving a positive orientation towards traditional or orthodox supernatural beliefs (for example, the virgin birth, scriptural inerrancy, the doctrine of the Trinity, a divine judgment after death, etc.), and a rejection of attempts to liberalize or reinterpret traditional doctrines in light of contemporary thought and experience. Conversely, the highly liberal orientation is defined as reflecting opposite tendencies. That is, it reflects a more man centered, Christianly humanistic orientation, in which contemporary thought and experience are taken quite seriously in interpreting, reinterpreting and often rejecting traditional formulations.

---

[11] See Burt Green, "Attitude Measurement," Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardiner Lindzey (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), I, pp. 335-369. See also Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 1-14.

[12] H. Richard Niebuhr's typology of theological orientations, while important, only emphasizes the complexity of the problem. Although the relation of Christ and culture constitutes the basic theme of Niebuhr's typology, it nevertheless consists of ideal types which are not readily adapted to any undimensional scale. See Christ and Culture (New York: Harper & Row, 1951).

It is obvious that such broad working definitions are too general to catch many of the more subtle nuances that divide (or unite) contemporary theologians. Nevertheless, if it is kept in mind that conservative and liberal, as defined above, represent polar points on a continuum rather than a simple dichotomy, then it is possible to locate a number of differing theological positions at some point along the continuum. For example, I would suspect obviously that extreme fundamentalist positions would occupy the most conservative positions along the continuum. Non-fundamentalist conservatives or evangelicals, for example, as represented by many of the contributors to the journal Christianity Today, would probably exhibit less extreme scores in the conservative direction. Neo-orthodox theologians with more supernaturalist leanings--Karl Barth, for example--would be located somewhere near the center of the continuum,[13] while more recent theologies of hope, with a stress on historical rather than supernatural categories, would be farther towards the liberal end. Where the Tillichians, Bultmannians, and older varieties of liberalism would fit on the scale is difficult to say, but they would, no doubt, be on the liberal side of the spectrum.

In addition to the possibility of locating specific theologians and theological "schools" on the continuum, it seems likely also that the conservative-liberal poles, as defined, represent, in a general way, the dominant cleavage that exists (perhaps increasingly so) in the church today. The research of Glock and Stark and of Hadden makes clear that there is a considerable lack of consensus among various Christian bodies regarding basic theological beliefs, and that this lack of consensus generally reflects the issues which I have conceptualized as constituting the polar positions on the conservative-liberal continuum.[14]

---

[13] It may be, however, that where neo-orthodoxy is located on the continuum depends on whether one is more interested in the theology of neo-orthodoxy or in its ethic. That is, theologically, it would fall on the conservative side of center, but ethically, it falls on the liberal side. If one considers both, then perhaps the center position is more or less accurate because the theological and ethical "average out." I am indebted to Dr. Samuel Blizzard for this suggestion.

This conservative-liberal scale was the basic instrument used to measure the theological orientations of the respondents; however, an additional scale was also developed out of the belief statements included in the Danforth study to measure the degree of theological certainty indicated by the respondents. (See Appendix C for a brief description of this scale). As the name implies, it measures the degree to which the individual is certain (that is, has no doubts) about the truth of his basic theological affirmations, on the one hand, or entertains considerable uncertainty and ambiguity over his basic beliefs, on the other hand. It is clear that this second scale is rather closely related to the major conservative-liberal scale, as that scale was defined above. Nevertheless, it has its own distinct focus, and at least passing attention will be given to it as a further means of understanding potential differences that exist among graduates of the three types of seminaries.

---

[14] See Glock and Stark, Religion and Society in Tension, op. cit., pp. 86-122; and Rodney Stark and Charles G. Glock, American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968). See also Hadden, The Gathering Storm, esp. pp. 37-68. For a non-sociological appraisal of the cleavage, see Steadman Bagby, "Conservative vs. Liberal Views: A Chasm Needs a Bridge," Christian Advocate (February 10, 1966), pp. 9-10.

II. SEMINARY EFFECTS ON THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS

In Chapter One, the hypotheses of the study were stated. With the intervening considerations of the historical roots and the empirical correlates of the three types of schools now in mind, these hypotheses regarding theological orientations may be repeated. It was hypothesized that differences in theological orientation would be partially explained by the type of school attended. More specifically, the Religious Community was expected to influence the greatest proportion of conservative orientations, while the Graduate School model was expected to influence the development of the largest proportion of liberal orientations. The Vocational School was expected to represent a middle position between the two extremes, but with slightly more affinity with the Religious Community model. Reflection on the historical and organizational characteristics of the three types of schools suggests the logic for these predictions. For example, regardless of denominational heritage the combining of mastery of tradition with spiritual formation in the Religious Community rather than secular formation is suggestive of a more traditional, "closed-to-the-world" stance of this type of school. This, it will be recalled, was also suggested in the findings regarding institutional relationships and the kinds of activities in which students participate.

Furthermore, given the logic of a structural effects analysis, it was expected that those whose personal philosophy was in harmony with the modal philosophy of the school would be most likely to share the predicted theological orientation for each school. Nevertheless, those with "deviant" personal philosophies within each type of school were expected to be more in agreement theologically with their classmates in their respective schools than with those holding similar personal philosophies but attending other types of seminaries. Finally, it was expected that these differences would continue to be in evidence even when controls for a number of other theoretically important variables (to be discussed below) were introduced. To be sure, it is difficult, if not impossible, to rule out the possibility that the apparent structural effects are, in last analysis, due to an individual's selection of a given seminary because of personal and other characteristics which influenced his choice. Thus, the findings regarding structural effects must be judiciously interpreted, and it should be borne in mind that no claim is made that seminary structural effects account for the total variation in the dependent variables.

Table 31 summarizes the findings regarding the primary hypotheses.[15] Looking first at the differences between the three

---

[15] In these tables, a theological orientation score, which could vary between -35 and + 35, was computed for each respondent. For these cross-tabulations, it was necessary to group the respondents into considerably fewer categories. Four categories were created as follows:

Scores		Categories
-35 - -16	=	Conservative
-17 - -7	=	Mod. Conservative
-8 - +2	=	Mod. Liberal
2 - + 35	=	Liberal

TABLE 31

THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY*

SEMINARY TYPE

Theological Orientation	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Conservative	44.0	34.0	38.8	12.1	6.6	7.9
Mod. Conservative	31.1	31.9	31.5	24.7	19.6	20.8
Mod. Liberal	16.0	18.1	17.1	35.1	29.0	30.4
Liberal	8.9	16.0	12.5	28.2	44.8	40.9
TOTAL	48.4	51.6	100.0	23.3	76.7	100.0
N =	(405)	(432)	(837)	(174)	(572)	(746)

Theological Orientation	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Conservative	11.2	9.6	10.2	37.5	24.9	27.3
Mod. Conservative	37.4	25.4	29.9	28.7	25.0	25.7
Mod. Liberal	26.2	29.9	28.5	20.7	22.6	22.2
Liberal	25.2	35.0	31.3	13.1	27.5	24.7
TOTAL	37.7	62.3	100.0	19.3	80.7	100.0
N =	(107)	(177)	(284)	(251)	(1048)	(1299)

Theological Orientation	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
Conservative	1.1	5.2	3.5	16.7	34.2	31.8
Mod. Conservative	9.1	19.4	15.1	31.4	30.5	30.6
Mod. Liberal	28.6	36.3	33.1	21.2	19.6	19.8
Liberal	61.1	39.1	48.2	30.8	15.7	17.8
TOTAL	41.4	58.6	100.0	13.4	86.6	100.0
N =	(175)	(248)	(423)	(156)	(1004)	(1160)

*Percentages do not always add to 100% due to rounding.

types (social climates) of theological schools (comparing the "totals" columns of the left sub-table under each of the three types of schools) and ignoring the differences between individual philosophies, it can be seen that rather sizable differences in theological orientations do occur from school type to school type, and that the differences are in the predicted direction. The majority of the graduates of the Religious Community social climate fall into the two conservative categories (70.3%). In the third type, the Graduate School, only 18.3% fall into the two conservative categories, or a difference of 52%. Also, as predicted, the Vocational School graduates represent a middle position; however, the proclivities are more pronounced towards theological liberalism than towards the more conservative position which I expected them to profess.

To make these differences more clear, an Index of Dissimilarity[16] was computed between each of the types of schools (Table 32). This index, quite simply, is a measure of the proportion of persons in each of the three types of schools which would have to be redistributed into other categories on the theological orientation scale in order

---

The choice of -7 as the dividing point between conservative and liberal orientations was based on the median for the scale which was 7. The further division of the conservative and liberal categories was made on pragmatic considerations of having roughly similar proportions in each of the four categories.

[16] Otis D. Duncan and Beverly Duncan, "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices," American Sociological Review, XX (April, 1955), pp. 210-217.

TABLE 32

INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY FOR MEASURES OF THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY (BASED ON TABLE 31)

	D =
A. Dissimilarity Between School Types	
Religious Community - Vocational School	.30
Religious Community - Graduate School	.52
Vocational School - Graduate School	.22
B. Dissimilarity Within School Types	D =
Religious Community	.10
Vocational School	.14
Graduate School	.22
C. Dissimilarity Between Those With Similar Personal Philosophies But Graduates of Different Types of Schools	D =
Tradition/Spiritual	.38
Practical/Spiritual	.26
Tradition/Secular	.38

for the groups to be similar. The dissimilarity between the theological orientations of the Religious Community and Vocational School graduates is .30. Between graduates of the Vocational School and Graduate School models, the dissimilarity is .22. However, .52 of the graduates of the Religious Community and Graduate School models would have to be redistributed on theological orientations should there be no difference between them. The overall (average) dissimilarity between the theological orientations in the three types of schools is .35. These various comparisons make quite clear that there are not only important differences in basic theological orientations between graduates of the three types of schools, but also that the differences are in the expected direction.

It is also instructive to examine Table 31 with reference to the relationship among individual philosophies, social climates and theological orientations. This is necessary to see if, in fact, there are structural effects of the various types of social climate which function as social constraints independently of philosophies of theological education. In the first panel of the table, it can be seen that, while there are differences in the Religious Community between those holding philosophies congruent with the dominant Religious Community philosophy (Tradition/Spiritual) and others, the differences are not great (Index of Dissimilarity = .10). However, when those in the Religious Community whose personal philosophy is Traditional/Spiritual are compared with those of similar philosophy in other types of seminaries, there is a considerable difference (Index of Dissimilarity = .38). Only 36.8% of the latter group fall into the two conservative categories, while within the Religious Community over twice as many are conservative or moderately conservative. Similar findings are evident in the other two panels of Table 31. In both the Vocational School and the Graduate School, there is greater similarity between graduates within each type of seminary than there is between those ascribing to similar philosophies who are, however, graduates of different types of schools. As Table 32 reveals, however, there is somewhat less homogeneity within the Graduate School model than in the other two types (.22 as compared with .10 and .14); nevertheless, the structural effects of the social climate in all three types of schools are in evidence. The findings indicate, then, that not only are there overall differences between the theological orientations of graduates of each of the three schools, but, in addition, the social climate does seem to explain some of the variation in the socialization process over and above the effects of individual philosophies of theological education.

Could it be, however, that the effects of social climates are spurious, and that some other variable(s) (perhaps one of the several which social climate summarizes) is in fact "causing" the differences in theological orientation? Or, if social climates can be shown not to be spuriously related to theological orientations, what other variables might be operating to strengthen or weaken the relationship? No research can consider all possible factors, and only rigorous experimental research can control more or less adequately for the most relevant ones (if only by randomization). Furthermore, the method of analysis used here--cross tabulations--does not allow one to control for more than one variable, in addition to personal philosophy and seminary type, at a time. Thus the joint effects, individually and in interaction, of several other variables cannot be simultaneously considered as would be the case if more sophisticated multivariate techniques had been used. Nevertheless, even taking the control variables one at a time, several interesting findings occur. To avoid presenting a large number of individual tables and sub-tables, I have summarized these findings with reference to control variables in Table 33. Only the combined percentages of the two liberal orientations for each of the three types of seminaries are given, and no attempt is made to distinguish between individual philosophies within each school type.

Table 33 can be read instructively in two different ways. First, it can be read by comparing each of the row variables across the three columns. To do so will indicate whether, in fact, the social climates or types of seminaries continue to influence the theological orientations in the predicted direction, or whether the original relationships found are spurious. Inspection of the table from this perspective reveals that, in all but three instances, the original relationships between social climates and theological orientations hold; although, it is clear that controlling for other variables in many instances helps to interpret the original relationship.

One reversal of expected relationship occurs for Methodists in Vocational Schools, who are less liberal than Methodists in Religious Community Schools by 10.5%. It may be that the predicted relationship between social climate and theological orientation is spurious; however, I suggest that a part of the reason may be attributed to the use

TABLE 33

PERCENT LIBERAL ON THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND SELECTED VARIABLES

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Total Percent Liberal	29.6	(248)	59.8	(170)	81.3	(344)
Father's SES						
Low	25.3	(72)	48.9	(24)	73.5	(50)
Moderately Low	32.9	(59)	57.4	(56)	80.0	(88)
Moderately High	26.2	(56)	57.0	(41)	81.6	(80)
High	38.4	(61)	71.0	(59)	85.7	(126)
Denomination (Respondent's)						
Methodist	65.5	(116)	55.0	(93)	77.4	(96)
Presbyterian	48.2	(40)	53.7	(16)	81.1	(167)
Baptist	26.1	(11)	-	-	96.1	(25)
Missouri Synod Lutheran	5.5	(9)	-	-	-	-
Episcopal	52.8	(28)	75.3	(61)	80.7	(46)
American Lutheran	13.3	(44)	-	-	-	-
Decision Groups						
Normal	29.1	(203)	58.6	(123)	74.4	(281)
*Late	34.7	(44)	62.5	(45)	75.7	(59)
Seminary Preference						
1st Choice	26.1	(194)	62.4	(141)	80.0	(301)
2nd Choice	60.5	(52)	52.0	(27)	91.5	(43)
****Peer Perspective**						
Tradition/Spiritual	25.0	(86)	51.5	(36)	69.2	(54)
Practical/Spiritual	25.5	(53)	52.5	(42)	69.6	(32)
Tradition/Secular	40.4	(57)	68.7	(33)	87.0	(173)
Practical/Secular	40.8	(33)	71.7	(38)	79.5	(51)
Seminary Housing						
On-Campus	29.8	(163)	63.6	(112)	80.8	(235)
Off-Campus	29.1	(83)	53.8	(57)	83.2	(104)

TABLE 33 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Seminary Quality						
High	-	-	70.9	(39)	86.9	(219)
Medium	60.5	(204)	51.4	(18)	77.3	(95)
Low	12.4	(62)	60.8	(118)	79.6	(39)
Type Ministry Now						
Parish	26.9	(185)	51.8	(112)	75.8	(236)
Campus/Parish	29.4	(30)	81.0	(34)	92.8	(52)
Campus	68.7	(33)	92.3	(24)	98.4	(60)

* Worked in other occupations for more than two years prior to entering theological school.

** Five closest friends.

of the modal personal philosophies to classify the seminaries according to type. In at least two cases involving Methodist seminaries (see Table 2, above), the distributions on the four philosophies were almost bimodal, making for only slightly more Practical/Spiritual graduates than Tradition/Spiritual, or vice versa. This would imply a possibly "weak" social climate. Furthermore, the sample size for the Vocational School is less than half the size for the other two seminary types, introducing the possibility of greater sampling fluctuations in the proportions reported for the Vocational School. I believe that these reasons may account in part for the discrepant findings with reference to Methodists in Vocational Schools.

The other two "deviant" cases involve men for whom the seminary attended was second preference (Vocational School men were less liberal by 8.5% than Religious Community Graduates) and Vocational School graduates who attended schools ranking medium on the Quality Index. The latter group was 9.1% less liberal theologically than Religious Community graduates in medium quality schools. In addition to the aforementioned problem of the smaller number in the Vocational School type, the fuller tables (see Appendix D, Tables 51 and 52) from which these findings are summarized partially assist in interpreting these "deviant" examples. In both cases, when personal philosophies are controlled, the proportion of theological liberals in the Religious Community is reduced among those who hold the congruent Tradition/Spiritual personal philosophy. That is to say that the "deviancy" from predicted expectations comes more from those whose personal philosophy diverges from the congruent or modal philosophy than from those who share the modal philosophy. Thus in both cases the structural effects of social climates are partially mitigated by the control variable among those who do not share the modal philosophy. The differences, however, are not sufficiently large, even in the fuller tables, to make meaningful interpretation possible. I will return below to the question of those factors which make for "deviancy" by reducing the constraint of the social climate.

With the exception of these three "deviant" cases where the predictions were not confirmed, the remainder of the findings were in accord with the hypotheses. While any "deviant" cases tend to falsify hypotheses, the otherwise rather strong support for the hypotheses suggests that inadequacies or errors in measurement and sampling may be sources of the deviations rather than a demonstration of spuriousness. If this is true--and only further, more rigorous research can suggest whether it is true--then social climates do seem to continue to function as constraints influencing professional socialization in the predicted direction, even when other important variables are controlled.

The second kind of comparison which is possible in Table 33 is that between the different levels of the various row variables. While the major interest--that of the effects of social climate--has generally been satisfied, it is of obvious interest to notice how, within each of the types of seminaries, the several individual and organizational variables which were controlled for effect theological orientations as independent variables in their own right and help further to elucidate the relation between types of school and theological orientations.

When the association between parental socio-economic status and theological orientations is considered, it can be seen that, with relatively minor exceptions, the higher the parental SES, the greater the proportion of those indicating liberal theological orientations. Since the measure of SES takes education, occupation and income into account, I would suggest that one explanation of this finding is that the life styles and generally more permissive childrearing practices of higher status families make possible (although not necessarily so) a greater exposure of their children to alternative interpretations of the world and to rational, scientific modes of thought which would lead to a more liberal (as defined) theological orientation. The higher status parents themselves may or may not be more liberal, but it seems plausible that their children might become more liberal theologically than might be the case for children of lower status families.[17]

When the denominations of the respondents are considered, marked differences again appear, both between denominations in general and within denominations when type of school is controlled.[18] Thus, there are differences in basic theological position which can be attributed in part to denominational allegiance and in part to the type of school attended. The former differences--those of denominational affiliation--are similar to those found by Glock and Stark and Hadden in the previously cited studies.[19] In general, the rank order from conservative to liberal is as follows:

---

[17] See James Ranck, loc. cit., who reports that seminarians with liberal theological orientations tended to acquire these orientations later in life and to represent a change from family influenced ideology, while theological conservatives tended to acquire their ideology early in life.

[18] The denomination referred to here is the respondent's denomination rather than the affiliation of the school. Nevertheless, with the exception of the interdenominational seminaries, most respondents had attended schools of their own denomination. Where this is true, denomination operates both as a personal characteristic of the individuals and a unit datum of the school.

[19] See above, footnote 14 of the present chapter.

(1) Missouri Synod Lutheran
(2) American Lutheran
(3) American Baptist
(4) United Presbyterian
(5) Episcopal
(6) Methodist

Deviation from this ordering comes mainly among those who attended the Graduate School types, where, for example, Baptists are more liberal by 70% than graduates of the Religious Community model. These differences clearly support the contention of Glock and Stark and Hadden that the impetus towards ecumenicity today proceeds at a level other than that of widespread theological agreement.[20] While there are some obvious possible implications of this denominational diversity for theological education, especially in light of the trend towards establishing ecumenical clusters of seminaries, it will be best to reserve comment until the other aspects of the "professional self" are considered with reference to denomination.

---

[20] For a succinct discussion of this phenomenon, see Jeffrey K. Hadden, "A Protestant Paradox--Divided They Merge," Trans-action (July/August, 1967), pp. 63-69. See also Peter Berger, The Sacred Canopy (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 140 ff. While Hadden emphasizes unity at the level of social concern, Berger gives more emphasis to unity as response to bureaucratization which has made most denominations virtually similar structurally, and to the recognition of the futility of competition for increasingly scarce resources, i.e., members and money. Still another recognition of the social sources of ecumenicity is that of Robert Lee, The Social Sources of Church Unity (New York: Abingdon, 1960). Lee, however, fails to give attention to the considerable diversity of beliefs which exist in spite of the ecumenical movement.

In Chapter Five, reference was made to the differences that have been found to exist between those who decide to enter the ministry in a more or less "normal" fashion, (that is, who are less than age twenty when they decide and who do not first enter some other full-time occupation) as compared to the "late deciders." In that chapter, note was taken of slight differences which obtained between the two choice groups with reference both to personal philosophy of theological education and to the age at first considering the ministry (as a crude indicator of anticipatory socialization).[21] The normal group was more likely (by a slight margin) to ascribe to a philosophy of theological education in which mastery of the tradition was a major theme, and also to have first considered the ministry at an earlier date. In the comparison of the two choice groups on theological orientations, differences are once more evident; however, they are relatively small, especially with reference to those who attended the Graduate School type. There is a slight tendency for the late choice men to be more liberal theologically than the normal choice men, especially in the Religious Community where conservatism is the rule rather than the exception. These differences, though small, add further support to the previously mentioned findings of Coxon and Lindenthal concerning differences between the two types of choice groups, and they suggest the need for further studies of these groups.

---

[21] See Table 9 for these comparisons.

A further interesting finding becomes apparent when the previously mentioned preference for the seminary attended is examined. Respondents were asked if the seminary which they attended was their first preference. Although the large majority answered affirmatively, there was a sufficiently large proportion answering negatively to make analysis possible. There are perhaps a number of reasons why individuals do not attend the seminary which is their first preference, but no doubt denominational requirements and/or pressures, financial reasons, or failure to be admitted for academic or other causes constitute major reasons for not attending a first preference seminary. From personal observation in seminaries and from the observations of others,[22] I was led to suspect that those attending seminaries which were their second preference would be more likely to be "deviant" than those attending the seminary of first preference. That is, it seems plausible to suggest that "second choice" men would be less likely to have selected the school because of its social climate or ethos and less likely to be in full agreement with dominant goals than if the seminary were their first preference. That this is the case is clear from the table, although the degree of difference between first and second preference men varies with the type of school. The greatest variation is evident in the Religious Community model. There were 34.4% more liberals theologically among those for whom the school was their second choice. In the Vocational School, the second choice men were less liberal than their first choice peers by 10.4%, and, in the Graduate School, the second choice men were more liberal by 11.5%. Somewhat surprisingly, then, the Religious Community model, which is historically the most like a total institution,[23] has a greater proportion of "deviants" among the second choice men than the other two types. Further reflection, however, makes this finding less surprising. Most likely, the pressure to conform to the Religious Community ethos would be greater than in the other two types of schools. As youth often rebel against overbearing parents, so also may these men, already attending a school which was not their first choice, rebel against the conceivably greater pressures to conform. I would guess further, without confirming evidence, that, had the peer groups of these men been controlled for concomitantly, their peer groups would also have been "deviant" in comparison with the dominant social climate. That is, I suggest that a supportive peer group probably acts as a buffer, enabling its members to resist the dominant pressures to conform. Thus the theological conservative who attends a school where the dominant theological posture is liberal may find support in his conservatism among other "deviant" conservatives who form a close-knit peer group,[24] and the reverse is true for the liberal.

---

[22] I am especially indebted to Donald Ploch of Yale University for suggestions relating to the point under consideration.

---

[23] For a discussion of total institutions, see Erving Goffman, Asylumms, Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books), 1961.

Although peer group influences were not considered concomitantly with the question regarding first or second preference of the seminary attended, a measure of peer group philosophy of theological education was obtained. Unfortunately, however, given the nature of the sample, the peer group philosophies had to be derived by asking the respondents to indicate how their five closest friends in seminary would probably have ranked the four goals of theological education. There was no way of getting direct answers from the peers themselves. This obviously leaves a great deal to be desired. Nevertheless, taking these limitations into account, it can be seen in Table 33, that differences in theological orientation do vary with reported differences in peer group philosophies. Within each of the three seminary types, those who reported that their five closest friends held either the Tradition/Spiritual or Practical/Spiritual philosophies were considerably more likely to be conservative theologically than their fellow students whose peers held either the Tradition/Secular or Practical/Secular personal philosophy. To the extent that this measure of peer group orientation can be taken to be reliable, then the importance of peer groups, discussed in the preceding paragraph, is further supported and underscored. Anthony Coxon, in his study of Anglican ordinands, was able to use rather elaborate socio-metric methods in order to analyze the peer group structure of the theological colleges he studied. The conclusion to which he came also emphasizes the importance of peer groups as agents of socialization:

---

[24] In one seminary a group of students, predominantly from southern California, who represented what might be called an upper middle class conservatism (theological and otherwise), formed a very close-knit peer group which rather effectively shielded them from the liberalizing influences of the seminary. One is tempted to compare the effects of their peer group to the additive in the popular toothpaste that purportedly forms a protective shield around the teeth.

> They [the peer groups] thus function as an important institution for the diffusion of information and attitude, for sharing of experiences, for the articulation of troubles and difficulties, for the generation of consensus on topical happenings in the hostel and the wider world, and for the discussion of meaningful happenings in the day-to-day life. It is fair to say that they also acted as institutionalized occasions for the evaluation and criticism of other students.[25]

Clearly, then, as these and other findings to be reported below indicate, those responsible for professional (and other) socialization dare not ignore the importance of peer groups for their potential support or subversion of the aims of socialization.

Two variables, previously considered in Chapter Six, the index of institutional quality and the type of seminary housing (as an indicator of the scope of the seminary) were also used as control variables with regard to the structural effects analysis. As was indicated above, neither of these variables rendered spurious the relation between the types of schools and theological orientation. When these two variables are considered for their own effects, with type of seminary controlled, there is little of apparent meaningfulness that emerges. That is, no consistent relation between theological orientation and the quality index is evident within each school type. There does seem to be an association between the high quality schools and a liberal theological orientation; however, no clear relation appears in medium and low quality schools. Neither do any meaningful patterns appear with reference to housing during seminary (scope) and theological orientation.

---

[25] Coxon, "Anglican Ordinands," p. 428 f. See also Feilding, Education For Ministry, op. cit., p. 105, and Merton, et al., The Student Physician, op. cit., p. 220.

The lack of significance that was true for the quality and housing variables is clearly not the case when type of current ministry, the final control variable in Table 33, is considered. It should be clear that post-seminary influences on socialization, however important, are not the concern of this study. But, given the fact that the respondents in the study were already practicing clergymen at the time of the survey, there is the troublesome question of whether or not post-seminary experiences might--like pre-seminary experiences--account for differences in the measured socialization variables rather than seminary experience. Just as many conceivably important pre-seminary influences on socialization had to be ignored, so also was this the case with post-seminary experiences. One readily available post-seminary measure is the type of current ministry, and, for several reasons, it seems to be rather important. On the one hand the type of specialization within a profession indicates something of individual differences--differences of ability, of interest, of values. On the other hand, perhaps more important for the present concern with socialization, different types of professional practice provide different contexts or social structures which influence the practice of the profession. For example, Jerome Carlin has documented this quite clearly with reference to the legal profession in New York City. The context in which the lawyer practices--the large corporate firm versus solo practice--influences, among other things, the kinds of clients and cases a lawyer handles and the type of courts in which most of his cases are tried. These structural aspects of legal practice to a considerable extent affect the lawyer's adherence to the code of ethics of the legal profession.[26] Similar structural or contextual effects are operative in the type of setting in which ministry is practiced, as Hammond demonstrated in his study of campus ministers.[27] Even within this one ministerial specialization, Hammond found that, among other contextual effects, the degree of cosmopolitanism of the campus strongly influenced the style of campus ministry.

---

[26] _Lawyers' Ethics_. Also, see Peter Berger, _The Precarious Vision_ (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961), pp. 8-47. Berger discusses what he calls the phenomenon of "alternation" (or conversion) which, as Berger treats it, has considerable similarity to what here have been called "structural effects." While Berger is not concerned _per se_ with professional values and behavior, his discussion of alternation is helpful in understanding the importance of social context for changes in values and behavior. If I may be autobiographical, when, several years ago, I left the parish ministry to become a campus minister in a university, I became aware after some time of rather significant changes that were occurring in my thinking and behavior, so much so that, at times, I was not sure that my "old self" would recognize my "new self" if the two were to meet! I happened during that time to read

For these reasons, then, it seemed quite important to control for type of ministry. Although a question was asked in the follow-up survey concerning the type of current ministry (see Table 17 above for a use of these data), a simpler measure which utilized only three categories was available in the initial survey which had sampled men who were then in only three types of ministry: parish ministry, a combination of parish and campus ministry, and campus ministry. These three classifications were used as the control. As has already been noted, the type of current ministry reduces but does not eliminate the structural effects of the seminary social climate. The proportion of theological liberals sharply increases as one moves across Table 33 from the Religious Community to the Graduate School. However, within each type of school, there are striking contrasts between the three types of ministerial specialization. Being related to a campus situation, whether in a combined parish/campus ministry or as a full

---

Berger's book, and his discussion of "alternation" was of considerable help in gaining some perspective on the way that the altered context of my practice of ministry was profoundly influencing my professional values and behavior.

[27] Hammond, The Campus Clergyman, op. cit., pp. 75-80, passim.

time campus minister, strongly increases the propensity towards liberalism. Only in the case of the parish and parish/campus men who are Religious Community graduates are the differences insignificant. However, campus ministers who are Religious Community graduates are more than twice as likely to be liberal theologically than either the parish or parish/campus ministers.[28] These differences among types of ministers within each of the school types indicate that there are significant differences associated with type of ministry, whether these differences are the result of individual predispositions that lead to selection of a given type of ministry, or whether they are the result of contextual effects.

III. THEOLOGICAL CERTAINTY

Before concluding the discussion of the relation of seminary social climate to theological orientation, a final comparison is in order. It was previously mentioned that a scale measuring the respondent's degree of certainty or doubt about his basic theological affirmations was developed. This scale is not the basic concern of this chapter, but it is obviously of interest in a discussion of socialization into the ministry to consider whether the recruits have considerable doubt or considerable certainty regarding their basic beliefs. Items used in constructing the scale are discussed in Appendix C; however, as was previously mentioned, the scale reflects the degree to which an individual is certain about the truth of basic theological affirmations, on the one hand, or entertains uncertainty and ambiguity over basic beliefs, on the other hand.

---

[28] This finding is clearly in line with the previous findings of Hammond, *ibid*., and Hammond and Mitchell, "The Segmentation of Radicalism," *loc*. *cit*.

Rather than using cross tabulations as before, product-moment correlations between the theological orientation scale and the theological certainty scale were computed. The overall correlation between the two scales is .66 ($p < .001$). Since a high score on the theology scale indicated a liberal position, and a high score on the certainty scale indicated considerable doubt regarding basic theological affirmations, the conclusion seems to be that the greater the degree of theological liberalism, the greater the doubt or uncertainty one entertains. The relatively high correlation remained when type of seminary attended was controlled (Table 34).

TABLE 34

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN LIBERAL THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS AND A LOW DEGREE OF CERTAINTY REGARDING BASIC BELIEFS, WITHIN EACH TYPE OF SEMINARY

Religious Community	Vocational School	Graduate School
.62	.69	.56
	$p < .001$	

These findings are not surprising, given the previously discussed conceptualizations of conservative and liberal theological orientations. Since conservatism reflects agreement with traditional or orthodox supernatural beliefs, and liberalism reflects a position open to rethinking traditional beliefs in light of contemporary thought and experience, one would expect to find more uncertainty regarding traditional beliefs.[29] What is of genuine concern, however, are possible implications of this uncertainty for professional practice and morale.

While the theological orientation measured here is more related to the minister's existential beliefs than to his cognitive knowledge about theology, as was pointed out above, the two are obviously not unrelated. Furthermore, it has been mentioned on several occasions that the professional's "esoteric" knowledge is one source of his authority as a professional. What then, by inference, are the implications of a low degree of certainty (or considerable doubt) about one's professional knowledge base and one's authority as a professional? Is such uncertainty corrosive of a sense of authority, both on the part of the professional himself and from the perspective of his lay public?

This question cannot be adequately answered from available data. One can only speculate regarding an answer. Before indulging in a bit of speculation, however, I should point out that, for Protestant clergymen, a qualification is necessary regarding the relation of the clergyman's knowledge as a basis for professional authority. The Protestant emphasis on the ministry of the laity (or priesthood of all believers) somewhat intentionally undercuts any distinctive authority which the clergyman may have as a theological expert. Without at all de-emphasizing the importance of theological training for the clergyman, the doctrine, ideally speaking, emphasizes the need for all Christians to be theologians. This undermines to some extent any special authority of the clergy as the possessor of esoteric knowledge which is unavailable to the laymen. Michael Walzer, writing of the importance of the sermon for early seventeenth century English Puritans as a means of educating the laity theologically, comments that "Theology was probably the first technical field of knowledge thus to be vulgarized."[30] In spite of the implications of the doctrine of the ministry of the laity for undermining professional authority based on special knowledge, it is nevertheless probably true that in all but the groups arising out of the extreme left wing of the Protestant Reformation, the authority of the minister as a learned man (including his theological expertise) did continue, as was noted in Chapter Three. And the question remains: is this authority, as it relates to theological expertise, being undercut by the uncertainty that exists regarding traditional theological affirmations?

---

[29] Hadden reports similar findings when, he compares scores on a biblical literalism index with responses to several of the individual items used here in constructing the theological certainty scale (Gathering Storm, p. 57).

---

[30] *The Revolution of the Saints, A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), p. 146. Walzer further comments that the Puritan clergy, although aiming at a relatively small public, nevertheless, "insofar as they reached this public, . . . undermined their own special position. The diligent listeners who took notes at sermons and later reviewed the argument in their diaries would shortly begin to argue with the ministers. And one day a lay intellectual like Milton would produce his own theology. The specialized knowledge upon which [the ministers] based ministerial superiority grew less and less significant as gentlemen (and gentlewomen), merchants, lawyers, eventually artisans as well, roamed ever more widely in their gleaning. But, in a sense, this was the intention of the ministers themselves--those of them at any rate, who transcended the nervous self-regard of the returning

As I indicated, the data at hand do not allow adequate answers. The results of several recent studies, however, suggest that the diversity of theological opinion and theological uncertainty are as acute among laity as among clergymen.[31] This in turn suggests, by inference, that the degree to which laymen acknowledge the authority of the minister because of his theological expertise is highly variable. Lacking any real consensus or certainty regarding the relevance of traditional religious doctrines and values, many laymen, so it might

---

exile. They sought support, and support is what they found . . . . They taught the twin ideas of purity and plainness upon which a new social order was to be founded, and they raised up a generation of godly laymen who made the authority of the ministerial brethren superfluous. And this was precisely their revolutionary role: the role of the intellegensia is to make special leaders from the intellegensia unnecessary." (Ibid., p. 147).

[31] See Stark and Glock, American Piety; Hadden, The Gathering Storm; and the section summarizing recent trends regarding religious beliefs in Demerath and Hammond, Religion in Social Context, op. cit., pp. 168 ff.

be inferred, would not place much significance in the authority of the clergyman as a theological expert. This, I stress again, is an inference that is not supported by any hard data.

Although hard data are lacking regarding the acknowledgment by laity of ministerial authority, there is evidence that, for those in this sample, the minister's own theological uncertainty is to some extent positively associated with a crisis of authority, or at least of a morale crisis. I will consider in more detail in Chapter Nine some implications of a measure of the minister's morale. Suffice it to say at present that there was found to exist a moderate negative correlation (-.35; $p < .001$) between theological uncertainty and high professional morale. This is to say that the greater the uncertainty regarding theological beliefs, the more likely is the minister to have morale problems regarding the significance of his profession. One can infer then that perhaps the laity's and quite likely his own uncertainty regarding traditional Christian beliefs, which are increasingly "deviant" in a scientific, rationally oriented society,[32] are partially responsible for problems of ministerial morale.

While other factors will be considered below which contribute to this morale problem, it is clear that the relation of theological uncertainty to low morale has implications for the professional socialization of clergymen. Perhaps no other profession, with the possible exception of law,[33] has quite the problem that those responsible for socialization of ministers have. For the conservatively oriented seminary, the problem is that of socializing men into a theological orientation that is to a considerable extent "deviant" from the prevailing societal values. The previously noted tendency for conservative theological orientations to have been formed prior to entrance into the seminary experience, plus the likelihood that the conservative minister will serve congregations which themselves are theologically conservative, tends to reduce the problem for the seminary to some degree. Both pre- and post-seminary experiences combine to support the more conservatively oriented seminary in its task. Still, the relative "closedness to the world" of the Religious Community seminary suggests awareness of the need for negating possible challenges to theological conservatism.

---

[32] See Demerath and Hammond, Religion in Social Context, p. 169; and Hadden, The Gathering Storm, p. 216. Also, see James Gustafson, "The Clergy in the United States," p. 733. Gustafson comments that "The dilemma of the modern clergyman is that he represents a historical tradition which in many respects is dissonant with contemporary knowledge and with the principles of practical life in the age of technology. He is no longer clear about his authority."

The theologically liberal seminary faces quite a different problem. Its problem is that of socializing recruits into a liberal theological perspective while, at the same time, preventing the often accompanying theological uncertainty and doubt from contributing to a negative evaluation of the significance of the profession. One way of accomplishing this has been that of enabling the students to reinterpret traditional doctrines to make them more relevant to the contemporary societal context (which, in fact, is nothing new, since this was the strategy of St. Paul as he moved from Jewish to Hellenistic contexts in his missionary journeys). The so-called "death of God" or "radical" theologians represent an extreme example of the alteration of traditional doctrine in light of contemporary experience.[34] Apart from such doctrinal reinterpretations, a second attempt at enabling recruits to the ministry to live with theological uncertainty without undue problems of morale has been that of providing for new sources of professional legitimation for ministers or reinforcing others which are not explicitly based on expertise in theology. The institutionalization of courses in pastoral psychology and counseling, clinical pastoral education, church administration, educational techniques, group dynamics, community organization, training for urban ministries, etc., represents efforts to establish professional expertise in areas more in harmony with contemporary societal values than is the case for traditional theological doctrine. I do not wish to suggest that such curriculum innovations are only, or even primarily, instituted to solve the morale problems of clergymen; nevertheless, such innovations are clearly not unrelated to problems of the professional authority of ministers in a secular society.[35]

---

[33] See Dietrich Rueschmayer, Doctors and Lawyers, op. cit., p. 21. While, as Rueschmayer points out, lawyers, like ministers, do not have an "esoteric" knowledge base that is unavailable to intelligent laymen, it seems reasonable to say that lawyers, perhaps for other reasons, enjoy rather high social esteem and exhibit less of a crisis of morale than is true for many ministers.

---

[34] Reinterpretation of traditional doctrine in light of contemporary experience always runs the risk of emasculating the doctrine to make it palatable to the changed situation. Recognition of this dilemma is seen in the following statement from the catalogue of a seminary (not included in this study): "Ministers and theologians who do not hear the affirmations or understand the concerns of sophisticated twentieth-century people will not be able to offer them a relevant ministry. But ministers and theologians who merely baptize these modern affirmations and concerns, giving them Christian names, will be of less service to a civilization in crisis. A theology of culture is not an acculturated theology." Chicago Theological Seminary Register, November, 1965, p. 6.

The question of the authority and morale problems of clergymen will continue to be a concern below. It is necessary now, however, to summarize briefly some of the major findings of this chapter. To recapitulate, the data seem to support the hypotheses regarding the influence of seminary social climates on theological orientations. Not only were differences in theological orientations found to be associated in the predicted ways with each of the three types of schools, but also, the influence of social climates was indicated in the considerable homogeneity of theological orientation found within each type of school, regardless of the personal philosophy of theological education of the respondents. Again, it must be remembered that individual selection of a given seminary type may account in part for the observed structural effects. The use of a number of additional variables as controls was an attempt to avoid claiming structural effects which were actually spurious. While it was impossible to control for all relevant variables, none of those which were used rendered the original relationships spurious; however, several of them did weaken or strengthen the previous relationships. Finally, the relations between theological certainty (or uncertainty), theological orientation and professional morale were briefly explored, and some implications for socialization of the association between uncertainty and low morale were considered.

---

[35] See Ivan Vallier, "Religious Specialists: Sociological Study," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York: Crowell Collier and MacMillan, 1968), Vol. XIII, pp. 444-453. Also, see Gustafson, "The Clergy in the United States," pp. 737 ff.

The conclusion, therefore, to which one is led by the consideration of this first aspect of the professional self--theological orientation--is that the social climates of seminaries are relatively important influences in the socialization of professionals. Other personal and social characteristics and experiences are obviously also influential, but the data thus far suggest that the influence of the social climate of the seminary cannot be ignored. Whether or not this continues to hold true with regard to the social ethical perspective of the men, as a further dimension of the professional self, is the subject of the following chapter.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL CLIMATE AND SOCIAL-ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES

I. ETHICS AND MINISTRY

In Chapter One, I made reference to the fact that professions vary in the degree to which there are "built in" or intrinsic values and norms that sanction and motivate the professional to become involved in social-ethical or political concerns. An article by Lipset and Swartz, comparing the "politics" of a variety of professional groups, was cited which indicates that, although various professionals become involved in socio-political affairs, these involvements are not always the result of values or norms intrinsic to the professional's role.[1] Rather, in many cases, the involvements are due to circumstances extrinsic to the professional's role. Nevertheless, there are certain professions which have intrinsic values and norms predisposing them to social-ethical or political involvements of varying degrees and directions. Lipset and Swartz summarize some of the available evidence as follows:

> The values inherent in different professions predispose the direction of their members' political orientation. . . . Implied here are the questioning nature of the scientist's mind, the lawyer's concern with the past, and so on. Little empirical evidence on these hypotheses is available, but some studies present evidence that scientists, as opposed to those with technical training and identifications such as engineers, are led to develop a broader perspective generally and more

---

[1] "The Politics of Professionals," op. cit., pp. 299-310.

> universalistic standards. They are less likely to identify with an employer such as government or industry and this also has implications for their greater political liberalism. In a Detroit study, clergymen who expressed a political preference were more likely to support the Republicans than might be expected on the basis of their class background alone. The author [Gerhard Lenski] is led to conclude that they were at least partly influenced in their political choice by the "identification of the Republican Party as the party of personal morality and integrity." Professional values of this sort may contribute to the conservatism of lawyers, (e.g., Lanski's suggestion that "lawyers' habits are rooted in precedent and tradition"), and because of their humanistic ethos, to the relatively greater liberalism of medical doctors among the more rewarded professions.[2]

The brief reference above to Lenski's study of religion in Detroit correctly recognizes that clergymen are among those professions with intrinsic values and norms which sanction and motivate a concern with the moral life of individuals and the society. This structural feature of the clergy role has a double implication, as will be pointed out below; however, the source of these intrinsic values and norms lies in the nature of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. As Gibson Winter has succinctly expressed it:

> Christianity is a historical faith, which is to say that its message of promise and hope is inextricably implicated in the events in which it became and becomes manifest. The appropriation of that message is inseparable from discerning it both from within those crucial events and correspondingly understanding it within one's own situation.[3]

---

[2] _Ibid_., p. 308. The references within the quotation include studies by William Kornhauser, _Scientists in Industry_ (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), pp. 153-155; S. M. Lipset, Political Man (New York: Doubleday, 1960), pp. 315-316; Gerard Lenski, The Religious Factor (Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1963), pp. 305-307; and Harold Laski, _Democracy in Crisis_ (Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1933), p. 141.

[3] "Theological Schools: Partners in the Conversation," _The Making of Ministers_, eds. Bridston and Culver, _op. cit_., p. 166.

While all religions, Christian and non-Christian, have some conception of and/or implications for "the good life," Winter's statement rightly indicates the inextricable relation of Christianity (and Judaism) with history and human affairs, and, by extension, with the moral quality of personal and social life. It is this "inner-worldly ascetic" orientation of Christianity, to use Max Weber's terminology,[4] that is the source of the values and norms intrinsic to the minister's role which sanction and motivate social-ethical concerns in a double sense.

On the one hand, simply as a man of faith, the minister is expected and motivated to be concerned with personal and social morality. In this he is no different from any other Christian, at least in the Protestant tradition. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize this rather obvious point as a structural aspect of the professional clergyman's role which must be taken into account. Indeed, one simply cannot ignore this structural feature of the clergyman's role and hope to understand some of the dynamics and dilemmas of contemporary clergymen.[5]

---

[4] See The Sociology of Religion, trans. by Ephraim Fischoff (Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), pp. 166 ff.

[5] See the previously cited works by Hadden, The Gathering Storm, and Campbell and Pettigrew, "Racial and Moral Crisis: The Role of Little Rock Ministers," loc. cit. Also, see Waldo Burchard, "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains," American Sociological Review, 19 (October, 1954), pp. 528-535. These works in various ways focus on role conflicts and strains which result from a clash between the normative or ethical concerns of clergymen as Christians and other dimensions of their professional role or of the contexts in which the role is enacted.

On the other hand, however, the "inner-worldly ascetism" of the Judaeo-Christian tradition has a further structural implication for the role of the clergyman _qua_ professional religious leader. He is expected, as a part of his role, to provide moral counsel and guidance to his congregation on various personal and social issues. Traditionally, this has been a part of the pastoral care role of the religious leader, which included preaching, teaching, pastoral discipline, as well as the pastor's own life and example.[6] Weber traces the origins of this role to the oracle and consultations with diviners and necromancers concerning magical means for coping with illness and other blows of fate.[7] Pastoral care, in ethical religions such as Judaism and Christianity, lost much of its connection with magical manipulations and came instead to have an intimate connection with the instruction and discipline of individuals with regard to concrete religious and ethical obligations. In Weber's view, it was especially the role of pastoral care which gave ethical religion its power:

> . . . the power of ethical religion over the masses parallels the development of pastoral care. Wherever the power of an ethical religion is intact, the pastor will be consulted in all situations of life by both private individuals and the functionaries of groups, just as the professional divining

---

[6] See the discussion of the traditional pastoral role by Feilding, _Education for Ministry_, _op. cit._, pp. 35-40. Feilding draws especially on the work of St. Gregory the Great, whose treatise, _The Book of Pastoral Care_ (c. 591) provides an early and important insight into the traditional concept of pastoral care.

[7] _Sociology of Religion_, _op. cit._, p. 75.

> priest would be consulted in the magical religions, e.g., the religion of China.[8]

Pastoral care, in the traditional sense of the term, today hardly seems the instrument of power that Weber describes, in spite of the fact, as Jeffrey Hadden has suggested, that the institutional church is still one of the broadest bases of potential support for influencing American society that exists today.[9] Indeed, perhaps one indication of the decline of actual influence may be seen in the circumstance that "pastoral care" has come to have a much more restricted focus today, referring now more explicitly to the role of counselling--often including mainly psychological counselling--of those who come to the minister with some sort of problem.[10] Whatever the case regarding the actual or potential decline of influence, either of the church or of the pastor, it is still a part of the role-expectation of the clergyman that he give guidance and counsel on moral issues as a pastor to his congregation.[11] Consideration of these two implications of the "inner-worldly ascetic" or ethical character of Christianity, then, helps to make clear the way in which values and norms are structural aspects of the role of the minister as a professional which sanction and motivate a concern for and involvement in issues of a social-ethical nature. Furthermore, it should be clear from the above discussion that these values and norms regarding social-ethical issues bear an intimate relation to socialization into the ministry; that is, they constitute an important part of the "point of view" or "professional self" into which the clergyman is socialized. Therefore, the concern of this chapter is to discover how and to what extent the three seminary types differentially influence the development of social-ethical perspectives. Since what was called the goal of secular awareness is most closely related to the development of the social-ethical perspectives, is there a difference in the perspectives of the graduates of schools in which secular awareness is given greater emphasis? Secondarily, as before, there is also the concern to assess other factors which are potentially significant influences on the social-ethical perspective. Finally, there is the question concerning the consistency or lack of consistency between one's social-ethical perspective and his theological orientation. These are difficult but important questions which will be explored in the remainder of this chapter. First, however, it is necessary to discuss the measures of social-ethical perspectives which have been utilized.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 76. For an interesting example of a contemporary religious group in which the religious leader exercises diffuse guidance in almost all areas of life, see the discussion of the role of the Hasidic rabbi or rebbe, in Solomon Poll, The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1962), pp. 118-127.

[9] Hadden, The Gathering Storm, p. 231.

[10] The words "come to" are emphasized, reflecting the less active seeking out of the "flock" by the pastor (shepherd), which the contemporary focus seems to imply. To consider this redefinition of the pastoral role is not my concern at this point. For a somewhat caustic and negative view of the "erosion" of the pastoral image, see Charles Feilding, Education For Ministry, op. cit., pp. 35-41. See also Samuel Klausner, Psychiatry and Religion (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964); Klausner, "The Religio-Psychiatric Movement: Participation by Protestant, Catholic and Jew," Review of Religious Research, V (Spring, 1964), pp. 63-74; and Klausner, "The Religio-Psychiatric Movement: Changing Ideology of the Movement," Review of Religious Research, VI (Fall, 1964), pp. 7-22.

---

[11] Clyde Reid, "Supervising Seminary Field Work," Christian Century, LXXX (April 24, 1963), p. 528, suggests the qualification that "We today are in a transitional period in this regard, moving from a concept of the minister as an authoritarian, professional figure to an image of him as enabler of the ministry of the laity, the whole people of God."

II. MEASURES OF SOCIAL-ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES

Several measures relating to social-ethical perspectives have been developed from the data available in the Danforth Study. These include: (1) a scale reflecting the current discussion concerning contextual (or situational) ethics versus an ethics based on principles, or, in popular terminology, the "new" versus the "old" morality; (2) a scale measuring attitudes toward the church's involvement in social issues; and (3) several scales measuring attitudes on concrete current social issues such as civil rights, urban problems, communism, and sexual morality. No attempt will be made to examine either the second scale or the third group of scales in any detail. The first scale--the contextualist-principles measure--will receive the bulk of attention, while the other scales will be used to illuminate further the findings regarding the first scale and to add to the understanding of social-ethical perspectives. Appendix C contains a discussion of the construction of each of the scales used. With the exception of the contextualist-principles scale, which will be considered in some detail in the ensuing paragraphs, the meaning and working definitions of the other scales can best be considered at the point that they are introduced into the analysis.

The first scale--that measuring the ethical orientations on the contextualist-principles dimension--reflects, as I indicated, an important current debate over the methodology of ethical decision-making. Although attitudes on the several specific issues mentioned above will supplement this scale, I have chosen to give special emphasis to ethical methodology. As I suggested in Chapter Five, given the rapid and complex changes in contemporary society, the methodology of ethical decision-making is probably more important as an aspect of seminary education than detailed knowledge of specific issues. It is far beyond the scope of this study to consider this debate except as it is necessary to indicate the dimension measured in the study and its relevance for socialization.[12] Here I will be concerned to give working definitions to the polar position in the debate, recognizing, however, that in so doing I risk grossly oversimplifying and possibly distorting the two positions and many subtle nuances in between.[13] Thus, at one pole of the debate, the principles positions centers around the belief that there are more or less fixed, eternal moral laws or principles which can be discovered by man in nature and/or known through revelation in scripture. These laws or principles guide ethical decision-making in prescribing the ends or objectives of action and in setting limits on the means appropriate to the ends. Christian love, rather than abrogating these principles, finds its highest expression and fulfillment in obedience to the principles. At the opposite extreme--the contextualist pole--there is a rejection of all principles or unchanging moral laws. There are no fixed rules or laws through which God acts. God is at work in the world "to make and to keep human life truly human,"[14] and in doing so, he is free to do and to command different things at

---

[12] Several summaries of the points at issue are available. Among the most helpful are two articles by James Gustafson. See "Context versus Principles: A Misplaced Debate," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (April, 1965), pp. 171-202, and his chapter, "Christian Ethics," Religion, ed., Paul Ramsey (Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965), esp. pp. 325-344. A much more exhaustive treatment of the debate may be found in Gene H. Outka and Paul Ramsey (eds.), Norm and Context in Christian Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968). Representative contextualist ethical treatises include Paul L. Lehmann, Ethics in a Christian Context (New York: Harper and Row, 1963); Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1966), and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics, tr. by N.H. Smith (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955). Perhaps the leading American Protestant proponent of an ethic based on principles is

---

Paul Ramsey. See his Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967). For a slightly different approach to an ethic based on principles or middle axioms, see John C. Bennett, Christian Ethics and Social Policy (New York: Scribner's, 1946).

[13] While I have chosen to present the working definitions of the two positions or methodologies in terms of the contemporary discussion among ethicists, it is important and interesting to note that Weber's discussion of the difference between priestly and prophetic ethical decision-making closely parallels the present debate. See Weber, Sociology of Religion, op. cit., pp. 76-77, 208-209.

[14] Lehmann, Ethics in a Christian Context, op. cit., p. 117.

different times. The man who is morally responsible is the man who responds to God in each new context or situation in a manner appropriate to God's humanizing work. He is able to be appropriately responsive to God because of the shaping of his conscience in the Christian community, or, to put it differently, because his thinking about what to do in concrete situations is shaped by his faith-relationship with God.

This brief characterization (hopefully not a caricature) of the polar extremes in this debate over the methodology of ethical decision-making is, as I previously warned, a considerable oversimplification. Furthermore, by emphasizing the extreme positions it fails to recognize commonalities of the two positions.[15] In both cases, it should be remembered that love (agape) stands as the basic dimension of ethical decision-making. Nevertheless, these are two genuine tendencies within ethical discourse today, and as methodologies for decision-making, they have potentially important but differing implications for the two previously discussed aspects of the minister's social-ethical concern.

For example, in the minister's own ethical behavior, as well as in his need to counsel his parishioners, it would seem that holding a more or less extreme principles position would provide a greater sense of security to the minister in the face of difficult decisions or counseling. Less of the burden of choice would be left to his or the parishioner's subjective decision. The contextualist position, however, places the burden of decision much more squarely on the minister or on the parishioner to whom he is related as an "enabler" rather than an ethical authority (see footnote 11 above). Thus he is potentially left with considerably more insecurity and uncertainty regarding the rightness of his decisions and/or counsel and, perhaps, less professional authority in a traditional sense vis à vis his parishioner than his principles-oriented opposite.

---

[15] See Gustafson's helpful discussion of similarities in the two positions in "Context and Principles" A Misplaced Debate," loc. cit.

Or again, as a further example of potential differences between the two positions, the minister operating from fixed principles is probably less flexible or adaptable in the face of rapid social change. Principles, with their fixed nature, quite frequently are difficult to adapt to altered circumstances brought about by rapid change, as witness the contemporary problems caused by the Roman Catholic ethical proscription of artificial contraceptive devices in light of the population explosion. The principles ethicist is faced with considerable problems of casuistry if he is to adapt traditional principles to new or rapidly changing circumstances. On the other hand, the contextualist position, for all of its uncertainty and insecurity, is freer of the overt need for casuistry and considerably more flexible as an ethical position for times of rapid social change.[16]

---

[16] Weber recognized this difference in the aforementioned (see

Given this general and considerably oversimplified orientation to the contextualist-principles debate, what are the probable relationships that exist between seminary social climates and these two polar tendencies in ethical decision-making? In Chapter One, in the introduction to the study, the primary hypotheses were stated with regard to social-ethical perspectives. To repeat them, it is predicted that differences in social-ethical perspectives will vary with type of school attended, with a progression from a principles to a contextual approach to ethics as graduates of the Religious Community, the Vocational School, and the Graduate School are compared in that order. Considering further the logic of the structural effects approach, it is also hypothesized that there will be more homogeneity within each type of seminary social climate concerning approaches to ethical decision making, regardless of the individual's philosophy of theological education, than there will be between individuals who held similar personal philosophies but attended different types of seminaries. That is, those holding "deviant" personal philosophies in the Religious Community, for example, will be more principles oriented than those ascribing to a Tradition/Spiritual philosophy but attending a type of seminary other than the Religious Community. Likewise, there will be more agreement with a contextualist orientation within the Graduate School, regardless of personal philosophy,

---

note 14 above) distinction between priestly and prophetic ethics. See Sociology of Religion, op. cit., pp. 208-209.

than there will be between the Tradition/Secular men in the Graduate School and the Tradition/Secular men in other types of seminaries. This, it will be recalled, will provide an indication as to the importance of the constraint of seminary social structure on the shaping of the dependent variable in comparison with the influence of the individual's personal goal orientation. Finally, with reference to concern with the possible consistency of the various dimensions of the minister's "point of view," it is predicted that the principles position will be positively correlated with a more conservative theological orientation, while the opposite will be true for those ascribing to a contextualist ethical position.

The logic behind these various hypotheses, as was the case with theological orientations, is suggested especially by the discussion in Chapter Three of the historical types of theological schools, which I have speculated that the seminaries in the sample more or less approximate. The relative differences among the three types of schools in the emphasis given to the goal of secular awareness seem especially important. That is, one would expect a greater emphasis on secular awareness as a goal of theological education to provide a correspondingly greater exposure to or emphasis on social issues, social problems and social change. That there are such differences is suggested by the descriptive data of Chapter Six, comparing the three types of theological seminaries. If this is the case, then it seems likely that such emphasis and/or exposure would, as I suggested previously, highlight the ambiguity and complexity of applying traditional ethical principles and thus make a contextualist position more likely.

Finally, some of the same tendencies which were defined as representing each of the two polar theological positions seem to be operative in the principles-contextualist debate, e.g., differing attitudes towards tradition and regarding the helpfulness of insights from contemporary thought and experience.[17] Thus, again, one would expect the Religious Community, with its high regard for tradition and its relative "closedness" to the world, to support a principles position ethically in distinction from the Graduate School. The Vocational School, as before, is expected to be more like the Religious Community, but, nevertheless, in a middle position between the two extremes. Similar reasoning also lies behind the predictions regarding the positive correlation between theological conservatism and a principles position and theological liberalism and a contextualist position.

III. SEMINARIES AND ETHICAL ORIENTATIONS

To test these hypotheses, the same general design which was followed in the preceding chapter will be utilized. Table 35 summarizes the findings for the first two sets of hypotheses, that is, those relating to the differences in ethical orientations associated with the three types of schools and the structural effects hypotheses. As with the scale measuring theological orientations, scores on the ethical orientation scale were grouped to form categories; however, in the present case, two rather than four categories were utilized.[18]

---

[17] In a recent study of theological students using a somewhat different approach from the present study, Paul Girling found a positive correlation between the measures which he used of theological liberalism and what he called a relativistic position on morality. Paul A. Girling, "A Study of Values Held by American Theological Students," (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968), Boulder, Colorado, pp. 144-145.

The first set of comparisons that can be made concerns the differences between the three types of seminary (comparing the "totals" column for each of the three sub-tables labeled as a seminary type rather than as "other"). First, the direction of the differences should be noted. As hypothesized, the proportion of contextualists increases as one moves from the Religious Community to the Vocational School and to the Graduate School. The size of the differences between

---

[18] In this scale, answers to five items were summed (see Appendix C), making a possible range of scores from 5 (extreme "principles" position) to 30 (extreme "contextualist"). The mean for the scale was 20.47, and the median score was 21. The median was used as the dividing point to create two categories. All scores from 5 to 20 were classified as "principles," and scores above 20 were scored as "contextualist." It will be noted from comparing the sizes of the mean and median and their relation to each other that the scale's distribution is negatively skewed; that is, the bulk of the scores tend to fall in the higher part of the distribution of scores. While there are a considerable number of lower scores, the scores are more concentrated in the higher range. Thus, there is a slightly stronger tendency overall to a relatively more contextualist than principles position. This should be kept in mind in relation to the dichotomization of the scale into the two categories as indicated above. The dichotomization was made near the mid-point in order to give relatively equal numbers in each category; however, given the negative skew of the distribution, there is a greater degree of variability among those categorized as "principle" than among those classified as "contextualist."

TABLE 35

ETHICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY

SEMINARY TYPE

Ethical Orientation	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Principal	59.4	53.6	56.4	42.0	35.0	36.1
Contextual	40.6	46.4	43.6	60.0	65.0	63.9
Total	48.5	51.5	100.0	23.4	76.6	100.0
N =	(406)	(431)	(837)	(175)	(572)	(747)

Ethical Orientation	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Principal	49.5	46.3	47.5	57.4	44.1	46.7
Contextual	50.5	53.7	52.5	42.6	55.9	53.3
Total	37.7	62.3	100.0	19.3	80.7	100.0
N =	(107)	(177)	(284)	(251)	(1049)	(1300)

Ethical Orientation	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
Principal	19.4	32.1	26.9	41.7	56.1	54.1
Contextual	80.6	67.9	73.1	58.3	43.9	45.9
Total	41.3	58.7	100.0	13.4	86.6	100.0
N =	(175)	(249)	(424)	(156)	(1004)	(1160)

school types is also important.[19] There is a total of 43.6% in the Religious Community who scored as contextualist. This is approximately nine percent fewer than is the case for the Vocational School. The proportion increases sharply, however, when the Graduate School men are compared. Seven out of ten--almost 30% more than the Religious Community and 20% more than the Vocational School--indicate a contextualist ethical orientation. Considering these findings and ignoring other possible influences, it seems clear that, ceteris paribus, the type of seminary social climate does influence the ethical orientation of the graduates. Further, it does so in the manner predicted.

A second set of comparisons concerns the question of the degree of homogeneity within each type of school, which is an important indication of structural effects of social climates in distinction from individual differences. Recalling the prediction of greater homogeneity on ethical orientation within each of the school types regardless of individual philosophy than will be the case for those holding similar philosophies but in different schools, it can be seen from Table 30 that this does seem to be the case. First, examining the Religious Community, the difference between those ascribing to a Tradition/Spiritual philosophy (the modal philosophy for the Religious

---

[19] No Index of Dissimilarity has been computed for these comparisons, since the dichotomized dependent variable makes each of the panels of the table a simple two by two table. In such a case, the percentage difference, when converted to proportion, is identical with the Index of Dissimilarity.

Community) and those ascribing to other philosophies is only 5.8%. However, when the Tradition/Spirituals in the Religious Community are compared with all others holding the same philosophy but in one of the other two school types, the difference is 19.4%. Or, to express it in terms analogous to the Index of Dissimilarity, only .058 of the graduates of the Religious Community would have to be redistributed so that there were no differences in ethical orientation for those ascribing to different philosophies of theological education; however, considering the groups of Tradition/Spiritual men alone, .19 would have to be redistributed for them to be similar in ethical orientation. Looking next at the Vocational School, there is a difference of 3.2% between those ascribing to Practical/Spiritual philosophies and those with any of the other three types of philosophies, or a dissimilarity of .03; however, when the two sets of Practical/Spirituals are compared, the difference is 7.9% or a dissimilarity of approximately .08. In the Graduate School, the difference between the Tradition/Secular men and all others on ethical orientation is 12.7% (dissimilarity = .13), while the difference between Tradition/Secular men in the Graduate School and Tradition/Secular men in the other types of schools is 22.3 (dissimilarity = .22).

Thus, to summarize the second set of comparisons, further support has been added to the importance of seminary social climate as an influence in professional socialization in addition to individual differences. The within-schools differences in each case indicate that those holding different personal philosophies of theological education differ on ethical orientation; however, in every case, they are more alike than are those who hold similar personal philosophies but attend schools with different types of social climates. It should be added that this latter finding was more weakly supported for the Vocational School than for the other two types.

In the preceding chapter, a number of other variables were introduced into the analysis as control variables to test for spuriousness in the relationship between social climate and theological orientations. These additional variables were also considered with reference to their own influence on theological orientations within each school type. Essentially the same pattern of analysis has been undertaken for ethical orientations. Since, however, the theoretical reasoning behind the choice of the variables as potentially important for socialization was considered in the preceding chapter, it is unnecessary to go into as much detail here. Table 36 summarizes the various comparisons. As before, I have attempted to simplify the presentation of the table by omitting the comparisons between individual philosophies of theological education and concentrating only on the differences between schools. Also, I have omitted the percentages for the principles ethical orientation and have included only the contextualist percentages. Since, however, there were only the two categories used, the reader may note the proportion of the principles orientation by subtracting the contextualist figure from 100%.

TABLE 36

PERCENT EXPRESSING CONTEXTUALIST ETHICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND SELECTED VARIABLES

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Total % Contextual	43.6	(365)	52.5	(149)	73.1	(310)
Father's SES						
Low	39.0	(111)	44.9	(22)	76.5	(52)
Moderately Low	49.2	(88)	41.3	(33)	67.3	(74)
Moderately High	37.4	(80)	55.6	(40)	73.5	(72)
High	54.1	(86)	65.1	(54)	75.7	(112)
Denomination						
Methodist	58.6	(106)	42.3	(71)	69.8	(88)
Presbyterian	63.4	(52)	62.5	(20)	76.7	(161)
Baptist	33.3	(14)	-	-	73.3	(22)
Mo. Synod Lutheran	24.5	(36)	-	-	-	-
Episcopal	50.9	(27)	71.3	(57)	67.2	(39)
American Lutheran	39.2	(130)	-	-	-	-
Decision Groups						
Normal	43.5	(309)	52.8	(112)	74.8	(258)
Late	44.1	(56)	51.4	(37)	65.8	(52)
Seminary Preference						
1st Choice	41.8	(315)	53.7	(123)	72.7	(274)
2nd Choice	59.5	(50)	47.3	(26)	76.6	(36)
Peer Perspective						
Tradition/Spiritual	41.2	(154)	50.0	(41)	68.2	(60)
Practical/Spiritual	41.2	(91)	51.2	(44)	62.3	(33)
Tradition/Secular	50.3	(77)	56.7	(34)	77.8	(168)
Practical/Secular	48.3	(43)	53.6	(30)	74.2	(49)
Seminary Housing						
On Campus	41.6	(229)	55.9	(100)	74.9	(221)
Off Campus	47.4	(136)	46.7	(49)	69.0	(89)

TABLE 36 (Continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Seminary Quality						
High	-	-	56.4	(31)	77.4	(195)
Medium	58.2	(196)	57.1	(20)	67.5	(83)
Low	33.8	(169)	50.5	(98)	65.3	(32)
Type Ministry Now						
Parish	41.7	(287)	45.8	(99)	69.5	(214)
Campus/Parish	43.6	(44)	69.1	(29)	73.2	(41)
Campus	70.8	(34)	80.8	(21)	91.7	(55)

Considering the table first for the possibility that the previously discussed influence of social climate is spurious, it is necessary to compare across the table, noting between-school differences for each of the school types. It can be seen that, in contrast to the previous comparisons for theological orientations, there are considerably more "deviant" cases, that is, cells where the degree of contextualism does not increase as predicted when one moves from the Religious Community to the Vocational School to the Graduate School. These deviant cases occurred for those with moderately low status, in several denominational comparisons, among the men for whom the seminary was second preference, among the seminaries in a medium rank on the quality index, and among those who lived off-campus for the majority of their seminary years. In all cases save one--Episcopalians in the denominational comparisons--the deviant cases occurred between the Religious Community and Vocational School graduates. In that case, 4.1% more Episcopalians in Vocational Schools were contextualist than were their counterparts in Graduate Schools. This percentage difference, however, is too small to be meaningfully interpreted, as is also the case for the differences found in three others of the deviant cases--Presbyterians, medium rank on the quality index, and off-campus seminary housing.

The fact that most of the reversals in predicted direction occurred between the Religious Community and Vocational School models, both here and in the previous chapter, suggests the need for more discriminating measures to differentiate between the two types of schools. As mentioned above, it seems that use of the modal personal philosophy of the graduates of a seminary as the measure of a seminary's social climate is not entirely satisfactory. Also, the relatively smaller number of cases in the Vocational School may have affected the findings. These problems may account for the discrepant findings.

As indicated, most of the deviant cases had percentage differences too small for adequate analysis. It is important, however to examine those cases where there were fairly large differences. In considering family socio-economic status, the one deviant case which occurred is a single exception to an otherwise apparently linear relationship between social climate and ethical orientation, with SES controlled. As in the previous discussion of theological orientations, when the full table (see Table 53, Appendix D) is examined, those with "deviant" personal philosophies in the Religious Community and Vocational Schools account for the reversal. Otherwise, those who conform to the modal philosophies of their respective schools tend to be slightly less contextually oriented in the Religious Community than the conforming men in the Vocational School. Thus, SES seems to have some effect on those who do not conform to the modal social climates of their respective schools, while it has less influence in the case of those who do conform.

A similar finding obtains for the men who indicated that the seminary attended was second preference. Having a deviant philosophy and attending a second preference seminary seems to reduce the constraining effects of the social climate. An examination of the complex full table (see Table 54, Appendix D) revealed that the "deviants" on personal philosophy, for whom the Religious Community was also second preference, were 22% more likely to be contextualist than "deviants" for whom the Seminary was first choice. Furthermore, they were 16% more contextualist than the conforming Traditional/Spiritual men who agreed, nevertheless, that the seminary attended was second preference. This considerably larger number of contextualists among the second preference men with non-conforming personal philosophies in the Religious Community is sufficient to prevent a linear relation from occurring as one moves from left to right across the table. While this finding interprets the relationship, as before, I believe that it does not render the overall relation spurious. It suggests again that double "deviancy"--holding a non-congruent personal philosophy in a school which is one's second preference--is a "protective shield" against the constraints of the social climate for conformity.

In the denominational comparisons, I also inspected the complete table and discovered that, as in the SES and seminary preference comparisons, the discrepancies in the predicted findings for Presbyterians and Episcopalians were cleared up. In both cases, the linear relation between the three types of social climate and ethical orientation held for those whose personal philosophies conformed to the modal social climate. Those with non-conforming personal philosophies were the "deviants" with respect to the predicted ethical orientation.

Personal philosophy, however, does not alter the discrepant finding for Methodists in the Vocational School as compared with those in the Religious Community. The Vocational School Methodists remain more principles oriented, regardless of personal philosophy, than Methodists in the Religious Community. This may be attributable to the previously mentioned lack of a really strong modal personal philosophy on which to base social climate in several Methodist seminaries or to the smaller number of cases. It may, however, mean that denomination renders the original relationship spurious. Before accepting the latter judgment, however, and in defense of the original hypothesis, one other word needs to be added with reference to the meaning of denomination in this table and elsewhere in the study.

It will be recalled that, while the measure used was the respondent's denomination, the seminary attended, in the large majority of cases, was the same as the respondent's denomination. Thus, denomination is both a personal datum of the respondents, and, with the exception of those in interdenominational seminaries, it is also a unit datum of the schools. For this reason, it is difficult to say with certainty that denomination renders the relation between social climate and ethical orientation entirely spurious. It is clear, however, as I will indicate below, that denominational differences exist within each type of school.

To sum up the discussion thus far, when the various control variables are introduced, the picture with regard to social climate and ethical orientation is somewhat confused. There are some indications that social climate is less influential in the formation of ethical orientations than was true regarding the ministers' theological orientations; nevertheless, the findings are not clear cut enough to say that the original relationship is spurious. What is indicated is the need for better measurement and the use of more sophisticated multivariate techniques which allow for the simultaneous control of a larger number of variables. Short of these refinements, I suggest that the data warrant a tentative acceptance of the hypothesis regarding the relation of seminary social climates and ethical orientations. It seems to be weakly supported, in spite of the deviant cases.[20]

---

[20] One additional argument, which is, strictly speaking,

When the control variables are considered for their own contribution to socialization while holding constant the seminary type, several interesting relationships can be noted.

The SES measures, when seminary types are controlled, do not reveal any consistent pattern, except that the largest proportion of men indicating a contextualist orientation are, in each school type, those who come from high SES families. I would suggest that these findings regarding men from high SES families are probably explainable by the same line of reasoning utilized with reference to theological orientations and SES; that is, the relatively more privileged family position of these men makes possible life styles which allow a greater exposure of these men to ideas and experiences which function to relativize, at least partially, traditional moral principles.[21]

---

statistically illegitimate, can be added in defense of the original relationships. The use of the gamma measure of association is legitimate only for ordinal (or dichotomized) variables. The seminary types are not ordinal; however, they do seem to function in many cases in an ordinal manner. That is, the relation between the three seminary types and the various dependent variables frequently seems to be a linear one. (My hunch is that this may be due to the spiritual-secular dimension used to form the typology). Because of this apparently linear or ordinal relationship, I computed a zero order gamma for Table 35, using the totals column for each school type as the basis for the computation. The gamma was .42. I then computed average within class gammas for the various tables which are summarized in Table 36. In no case was the original relationship (expressed by the zero order gamma) reduced to zero, or, for that matter, reduced much at all. This argument as indicated above, is not really legitimate, given the level of measurement; nevertheless, it is mentioned here, for whatever it is worth, as providing tenuous support for the validity of the original hypotheses.

[21] One exception to this overall relation of high SES and contextualism occurs when a further control is introduced for personal philosophy of theological education (See Table 53, Appendix D). Those in the Graduate School who ascribed to the Tradition/Secular

The denominational picture, as I previously indicated, is rather confusing. While on theological orientations, the rank order, controlling for school, was relatively similar in each case, this is not true for ethical orientation. It seems clear that denomination, per se, is too gross a variable with reference to ethical orientation to make meaningful prediction possible. Other, perhaps unmeasured, factors are probably operating to influence the differences.

Within the two choice groups, no significant differences occurred between normal and late deciders for the ministry, with the exception of late choice men in the Graduate School model, who were less contextually oriented by 9% than their normal choice counterparts. While the measures used here are quite different from those used by Lindenthal in the previously cited study of delayed decisions to enter the ministry, it should be noted that his "delayed" men were significantly more politically oriented than the younger (normal choice) seminarians.[22] The two findings would appear to be contradictory if, as I suspect, a contextualist orientation implies a more activist orientation, as Lindenthal suggests that his political measure implies. However, this may be an incorrect assumption on my part, since there is

---

philosophy and who were from high SES families, were 12.2% less likely to be contextualist than were the Tradition/Seculars from low SES families. In fact, considering only the Tradition/Secular men, those with low SES were more likely to be contextualist than any of the other SES cohorts. Further analysis is necessary before this exception can be interpreted.

[22] See Lindenthal, "The Delayed Decision," p. 111.

no reason why a principles orientation precludes an active political interest and involvement. There is, at present, no way of resolving the question, since the measures used are incomparable.

The findings regarding men for whom the seminary attended was first or second preference have already been considered. The comparisons according to prior perspectives suggest again--although not so strikingly as was the case for theological orientations--the influence of peers in supporting deviance from the dominant social climate. Also, while the differences are not large, it seems evident that living off campus tends to increase deviance. The scope of the seminary--its capacity to exercise control over its participants--does seem to be affected by living arrangements. Those on campus are more strongly constrained by the seminary social climate.

In the comparisons of seminaries by the index of institutional quality, in all but one case there is a consistent positive association between seminary quality and a contextualist orientation. The "deviant" case--the Vocational School model--has practically equal proportions of contextualists in medium and high quality schools; although, both proportions are greater than the Vocational Schools which scored low on the quality index. To some extent then, an increase in institutional quality, as measured in the composite index, does seem to increase the likelihood of socializing men into a contextual ethical orientation, whether by confronting them with a greater awareness of relativity, or of the complexity of ethical decision making, or by attracting students already contextually oriented. Also, there may be a clue from an earlier finding by Hartshorne and Froyd. In their study of theological education in the Baptist churches, they did not measure contextual versus principles orientations. However, they did conclude that there is a positive association between quality training and awareness of human need (and, thus, perhaps of a less rigid principles position):

> One of the most evident facts disclosed in the study thus far is that awareness of human need is in large measure a function of training. Other things being equal, the better training a person has, the more sensitive he becomes to the problems of people.[23]

Finally, it may be noted that, as with theological orientations, the type of current ministry is particularly discriminating. Campus ministers within each school type are between 20 and 35% more likely to be contextualist than are parish ministers. Clearly, as previously discussed, the campus seems both to attract and to shape further men who are both liberal theologically and contextual ethically.

The reference to the affinity between theological liberalism and a contextual ethical position suggests one further interesting comparison which may be noted before briefly examining several other measures of social/ethical perspectives. It will be recalled that, in dichotomizing the scale for ethical orientation, I made it possible for a person to have a relatively high score on the scale (see footnote 18 above) and still be regarded as having a principles orientation.

---

[23] Hartshorne and Froyd, op. cit., 163.

Comparing Tables 31 and 35 it can be seen that there is still a larger proportion of men in the Religious Community who are contextualist than was the case regarding moderately liberal or liberal theological orientations. This is true in spite of the relatively greater ease in being classified in either of the two liberal theological categories in comparison with being classified as a contextualist. Thus, there are 43.6% contextualist ethicists, but only 29.6% theological liberals in the Religious Community. Interestingly, however, the Graduate School model shows tendencies in the opposite direction; that is, there are slightly more moderately liberals and liberals theologically in the Graduate School model (81.3%) than there are ethical contextualists (73.6%). The same is true for the Vocational School (64% as compared with 55.9%). If the scales are valid measures of their respective theoretical concepts, then these findings suggest that there is greater similarity among ministers on ethical orientations than there is on theological orientations. Further, this relative similarity is in a contextual direction. This does not imply agreement; after all, there is a 30% difference on ethical orientations between graduates of two of the types of seminaries, and there is also a relatively high positive product-moment correlation of .54 between a contextual ethical orientation and theological liberalism. Nevertheless, there is relatively greater homogeneity ethically than theologically among the ministers. Perhaps the complexity of contemporary society and its pluralistic nature make it increasingly difficult to hold to a rigid principles ethical position even if one is relatively conservative theologically.

IV. OTHER MEASURES OF SOCIAL-ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES

Earlier in this chapter, I indicated that several other measures relating to social-ethical concerns were available in the Danforth data. Space precludes any detailed consideration of these measures; however, since the principles-contextualist debate refers basically to the methodology of ethical decision-making rather than to more specific ethical issues, it will be helpful, before concluding this chapter, to give brief attention to these other available measures.

First, there is a scale measuring attitudes towards the involvement of the church in social issues. As a number of recent studies have indicated, there is probably no issue more likely to divide Christians today than the one reflected in this scale.[24] The Glock, Ringer and Babbie study captures the dilemma in the title of the book, To Comfort and To Challenge. Is the church, by virtue of its calling, to be involved in the social issues of the day in such a way as to challenge men to end social injustice, or is the church's main mission that of providing comfort and strength to those who are perplexed and bewildered by a changing world? Another slightly different way of expressing the dilemma has to do with the old question of whether the task of the church is to work directly for change in social, economic and political spheres, or to convert individuals on the premise that changed persons make a changed society. Billy Graham, for example, has basically been a representative of the latter point of view. Admittedly, in last analysis, a case can be made for the point that, as dichotomies, these expressions of the dilemma overstate the differences, and that the differences between challenge and comfort or social versus individual emphases are not irreconcilable. I do not deny this; yet, the evidence suggests that the dimension measured by the scale--positive and negative attitudes towards church involvement in social issues--is not an imaginary or artificial one in the minds of many church members today.

---

[24] See Hadden, The Gathering Storm, and Charles Y. Glock, Benjamin B. Ringer and Earl R. Babbie, To Comfort and to Challenge: A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church (Berkeley, California: The University of California Press, 1967). Also, a recent survey by The New York Times (August 10, 1969) reported declining contributions to the national budgets of the country's large denominations and to the National Council of Churches. The cut-backs in giving are attributed in part to a backlash at the local level in opposition to the social activism of the churches at the national level.

Given the historical background of the seminary types and the previously considered differences in theological and ethical orientations, one would expect that the Religious Community graduates would be least favorable towards church involvement in social issues, and that the proportion of favorable attitudes would increase in the Vocational School and be the greatest in the Graduate School. Table

37 summarizes the findings.[25]

The first and most important finding is the comparatively weak association between seminary type and attitude toward church involvement in social issues. While the percentage differences between the three school types do vary as predicted, the variation is not striking. The biggest differences are between the Religious Community and the other two types.

The Index of Dissimilarity between the Religious Community and the Vocational School is.13, and it is .16 between the Religious Community and the Graduate School. Only .03 dissimilarity exists between the Vocational School and the Graduate School models. Thus, the differences that exist between ministers in attitudes toward church involvement in social issues are only weakly attributable to the type of school attended. Either the seminaries have little influence in this matter, or their influence is not strikingly different regardless of the type of social climate. I would have to assume that the former rather than the latter is the case, given the rather sharp differences which were found in previous comparisons to be associated with seminary type. Before any firm conclusions

---

[25] Items used in constructing this scale can be found in Appendix C. The items formed a Guttmann scale with five scale positions. The mean was 2.55 and the median was 2.51. The coefficient of reproducibility is .89. The five scale positions were collapsed into three for purposes of cross tabulation:

0 - 1 = Negative
2 - 3 = Mixed
4 = Positive

TABLE 37

ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH'S INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIETY BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY

Church Involvement in Society	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Negative	30.4	23.4	26.8	16.0	10.8	12.0
Mixed	43.7	47.5	45.6	50.9	51.9	51.7
Positive	25.9	29.2	27.6	33.1	37.2	36.3
Total	48.4	51.6	100.0	23.4	76.6	100.0
N =	(405)	(432)	(837)	(175)	(572)	(747)

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Negative	8.4	16.9	13.7	24.3	20.4	21.2
Mixed	49.5	52.0	51.1	51.4	47.1	47.9
Positive	42.1	31.1	35.2	24.3	32.5	30.9
Total	37.7	62.3	100.0	19.3	80.7	100.0
N =	(107)	(177)	(284)	(251)	(1049)	(1300)

	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
Negative	13.4	10.9	11.1	15.4	24.2	23.0
Mixed	45.7	55.4	51.4	55.8	46.1	47.4
Positive	42.9	33.7	37.5	28.8	29.7	29.6
Total	41.3	58.7	100.0	13.4	86.6	100.0
N =	(175)	(249)	(424)	(156)	(1004)	(1160)

may be drawn, however, further analysis is necessary.

Interestingly, the product-moment correlation between the church involvement scale and the theological orientation scale is a moderately weak .33 ($p < .01$), and between the church involvement scale and the ethical orientation scale it was a slightly weaker .29 ($p < .01$). It should be recalled that between the theological and ethical orientation scales the correlation was a much more healthy .54. Therefore, while being liberal theologically is a relatively good predictor that one will also be contextual ethically, neither theological liberalism nor ethical contextualism is a particularly good predictor that one will strongly favor the church's involvement in social issues. This is not to suggest that the ministers in the sample are necessarily more negative toward church involvement than they are theologically liberal or contextual in ethics. As a matter of record, when the distribution of respondents over all five scale positions is considered rather than the three combined categories, it is evident that there is a healthy proportion at the upper (favorable) end of the scale (Table 38). This distribution suggests that perhaps a number of those more conservative theologically and principles oriented ethically are, at the same time, positive toward the church's involvement in social issues. This, too, needs to be further analyzed before drawing any firm conclusions, but to do so at this point is beyond the scope of this study. For present purposes, the interesting point is the unexpectedly low degree of association between seminary type and attitude toward involvement of the church in social issues. The direction of association, however, was as predicted.

TABLE 38

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION FOR THE SCALE TYPES ON THE SCALE MEASURING ATTITUDES TOWARD CHURCH INVOLVEMENT IN SOCIAL ISSUES

		%	(N=)
Least Favorable	0	10.8	(171)
	1	9.0	(143)
	2	25.7	(407)
	3	22.8	(361)
Most Favorable	4	31.7	(502)
	Total	100.0	(1584)

Finally, brief mention may be made of a cluster of indices on specific current social issues about which there has been considerable ethical discourse and on which ministers would be expected to have opinions. The working definition of each of the indices is straightforward and more or less obvious from the designation given to it. The indices include, first, a measure of positive or negative attitudes toward the struggle for civil rights for blacks. A second index concerns attitudes towards government involvement in social welfare programs such as health, poverty, education, etc. A third issue on which attitudes have been measured is the ideologically charged debate over the menace of communism to the "American Way of Life." Do ministers agree or disagree regarding the threat of communism? A fourth index was constructed to measure the ministers' degree of sympathy toward crucial issues facing urban areas and the responsibility of the church for a ministry within the central cities of the nation. Finally, there is a scale measuring attitude toward sexual morality, especially the degree of agreement or disagreement with traditional Christian approaches to pre-marital and extra-marital sexual relations. It is on the issue of sexual morality in particular that the principles-contextualist debate has been strong.[26]

Since an analysis of attitudes on each of these issues would perhaps prove rather repetitious, I have chosen to consider only one--that concerning civil rights--with reference to association with school type. The others, while representing obviously important social issues, will be considered mainly for their correlations with the theological and ethical orientations scales. The examination of the civil rights measure--reflecting clearly a major social issue in which ministers and churches have been variously embroiled--will serve as an illustration of the association of seminary type with attitudes toward a concrete social issue. The prediction, as before, is that positive attitudes towards civil rights will increase as one moves from the Religious Community to the Vocational School to the Graduate School models. Table 39 contains the findings.[27]

---

[26] See, for example, the previously cited book by Joseph Fletcher, Situation Ethics, op. cit., pp. 79-80, and passim; John A. T. Robinson, Christian Morals Today (Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1964), especially pp. 41-45; and Towards A Quaker View of Sex (London: Friends Home Service Committee, 1963), for examples of contextualist approaches to sexual morality. For a principles position (and a critique of contextual sexual ethics), see Ramsey, Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics, op. cit., pp. 11-20, and passim.

Interestingly, as inspection of the table reveals, the relation between school type and attitudes toward civil rights is slightly curvilinear rather than rectilinear. There is, as expected, a significantly greater proportion of men holding highly positive attitudes in the Graduate School than in the Religious Community (21.1%). However, there are slightly fewer very positive men in the Vocational School than in the Religious Community, although the difference in that category is too small to interpret. Nevertheless, when the negative to moderately negative category is considered, there is almost 10% more in this category in the Vocational School than in the Religious Community. This is reflected in the Index of Dissimilarity between schools. The dissimilarity between the Religious Community and Vocational School is .06. Between the Religious Community and the Graduate School, it increases to .21. However, .24 of the Vocational

---

[27] The scale scores had a possible range of 28 points, from -25 (negative) to 2 (positive). Actually, although there were respondents who scored as low as -23, the mean for the scale was a rather high -3.72, and the median was -3.0. Thus the men were rather positive overall concerning civil rights. The scores were grouped into three categories for purposes of cross tabulation. Cutting points were chosen to get relatively similar proportions in the three categories, which are as follows:

-23 to -7 = Negative to moderately negative
-6 to -1 = Moderately positive
0 to 2 = Highly positive

TABLE 39

ATTITUDE TOWARDS CIVIL RIGHTS BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
Civil Rights	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Somewhat Conservative	30.9	27.3	29.0	20.1	20.6	20.5
Moderate	43.5	45.8	44.7	43.1	41.4	41.8
Liberal	25.7	26.9	26.3	36.8	37.9	37.7
Total	48.4	51.6	100.0	23.3	76.7	100.0
N =	(405)	(432)	(837)	(175)	(572)	(746)

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Somewhat Conservative	40.2	31.2	34.6	32.7	20.6	22.9
Moderate	36.4	44.9	41.7	43.4	43.8	43.7
Liberal	23.4	23.9	23.7	23.9	35.7	33.4
Total	37.8	62.2	100.0	19.3	80.7	100.0
N =	(107)	(176)	(283)	(251)	(1049)	(1300)

	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
Somewhat Conservative	5.1	14.5	10.6	22.4	31.5	30.3
Moderate	39.4	43.8	42.0	50.6	42.8	43.8
Liberal	55.4	41.8	47.4	26.9	25.7	25.9
Total	41.3	58.7	100.0	13.5	86.5	100.0
N =	(175)	(249)	(424)	(156)	(1003)	(1159)

School men would have to be redistributed if the Vocational and Graduate Schools were to be similar. Thus, by an admittedly slight difference, the Religious Community graduates, who have generally been found to be conservative on most issues, are slightly less so than the Vocational School graduates on the issue of civil rights. Perhaps--although this is speculation--the somewhat greater emphasis given to mastery of the Christian tradition, with its norms of brotherly love, makes the difference.

Finally, brief mention can be made of the other measures of specific social issues which were mentioned above. As previously indicated, I will not consider them in relation to their association with the seminary types.[28] Instead, their correlations with both theological orientations and the contextualist-principles scale, as well as their intercorrelations with each other, will be considered. To do this will hopefully further elucidate the meaning of the major measures of the study. Table 40 gives the intercorrelation matrix of the various scales.

From inspection of the matrix, it can be seen that there is considerable variation in the size of positive and negative correlations

---

[28] I did examine these relationships, and, although the tables and discussion of them are omitted, it can be reported that the relationships, while varying in intensity, were generally as the previously examined ones have been; that is, a general progression from a more conservative to a more liberal position as one moved from the Religious Community to the Vocational School to the Graduate School. The most significant differences occurred in the comparisons relating to anti-communist attitudes and attitudes towards traditional sexual morality.

TABLE 40

PRODUCT-MOMENT INTERCORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS SOCIAL ETHICAL AND THEOLOGY SCALES

	Theological Orientation	Ethical Orientation	Church Involvement in Social Issues	Civil Rights	Government Responsibility	Anti-Communism	Urban Problems	Traditional Sexual Morality
Theological Orientation	-	.54	.33	.41	.44	-.63	.24	-.63
Ethical Orientation		-	.29	.35	.31	-.43	.23	-.54
Church Involvement in Social Issues			-	.30	.30	-.27	.29	-.28
Civil Rights				-	.38	-.51	.30	-.43
Government Responsibility					-	-.48	.31	-.40
Anti-Communism						-	-.30	.54
Urban Problems							-	-.40
Traditional Sexual Morality								-

N = 1493 $P < .01$

NOTE: All of the scales have been scored so as to give a favorable response to the attitude measured. In all but two of the scales--anti-communism and traditional sexual morality--a "favorable" answer is equivalent to a more or less liberal response. Thus for all scales save the two mentioned the intercorrelations are positive.

of the social issues scales with the two primary scales. Theological liberalism is not only relatively strongly correlated with a contextual ethical orientation, but it is moderately correlated with a favorable attitude toward civil rights and government responsibility for social welfare. A strong negative correlation exists between theological liberalism and anti-communism and a favoring of traditional sexual morality. This positive correlation of liberal theological views and liberal attitudes on various social issues and vice versa, is not unanticipated. Rather, it generally agrees with previous findings such as those reported by Hadden[29] and Benton Johnson.[30] Hadden found, however, that a similar correlation does not seem necessarily to be the case for laity.[31]

In considering the correlations of the social issues indices with the measure of ethical orientation, it is important to recall that the scale is scored in such a way that the higher the score the more contextual the orientation; therefore, a strong positive correlation with the ethical orientation scale implies relative agreement with the contextualist position. It can be seen that, although most correlations are moderately strong between ethical orientation and the social issues scales, they are not quite so strong, positively or negatively, as the correlations of theological orientations and social issues. Nevertheless, it is clear that to be a contextualist is not to be strongly anti-communist. Here, it should be remembered that the opposite of anti-communist need not necessarily be pro-communist, but rather believing that the threat of communism is not so great as the strong anti-communists imagine. Also, a contextualist, as expected, is not generally disposed to support strongly traditional attitudes towards sex. There is a moderately positive relation between favorable attitudes towards civil rights and contextualism; although, it will be recalled that there is considerable homogeneity of attitudes in general (for the most part moderate to highly positive) on civil rights. The other measures--government responsibility for social welfare and the measure of support for urban problems--are less strong. This does not, however, imply necessarily that ministers are generally opposed to government social welfare programs or unfavorable to urban problems. It may imply just the opposite; that is, regardless of whether one holds a contextualist position or not, one may favor government social welfare programs and be sympathetic to urban social problems. Actually, the overall distributions on the urban issues scale in particular reveal considerable positive support for urban problems.

---

[29] Hadden, The Gathering Storm, pp. 73-83.

[30] Benton Johnson, "Theology and Party Preference Among Protestant Clergymen," American Sociological Review, XXXI (April, 1966), pp. 200-208.

[31] The Gathering Storm, pp. 90-99.

This variety of findings regarding the correlations between the scales is highly suggestive. If the several measures are valid and reliable, as I believe they are, then it seems that one's theological orientation, in comparison with his stance on the principles versus context issue, is a slightly better predictor of attitudes on the various social issues. It will be recalled that I previously suggested that the principles-context debate seems to be more of a methodological than a substantive issue. Thus, one individual may affirm the importance of principles in decision-making and hold quite similar attitudes on various social issues as another individual operating from a contextual stance. In general, however, both persons would also probably be somewhat liberal theologically. The theological conservative, on the other hand, would be more likely to be both principles oriented and somewhat conservative on the various social issues. Considerably more analysis, controlling for other possibly relevant variables, is needed in order to clarify the meaning of these correlations. Furthermore, in spite of the relatively higher correlations of the various social issues scales with theological orientations than with the principles-context measure, it is clear that the "thrust" of the contextualist position is towards a more liberal position on the various social issues (and theologically as well) than is the case for those who affirm a principles orientation.

The most important test of these differences, unfortunately, was not measured in the survey; that is, to what extent are the various orientations--theological and ethical--associated with specific ethical behavior? If the men were observed or measured with reference to some action that involved, for example, a controversial decision, would theological orientation or ethical orientation be more highly correlated with the action taken? My suspicion is that both theology and ethics would have some bearing on the behavior, but that neither would be sufficient to explain the behavior. Rather, on the basis of previous findings,[32] I would suspect that structural or situational factors would be more salient as explanatory variables, in last analysis, than would theological or ethical orientations. For example, as Hadden found, whether a minister took part in civil rights demonstrations depended only in part on his internalized beliefs and attitudes. Without a theological and ethical orientation that sanctioned involvement, he would not have been likely to put himself in a position to become involved. But, regardless of the strength of his convictions, most ministers studied were unlikely to become actively involved unless factors in the social structure were favorable--e.g., strong denominational sanction of civil rights, a supportive or at least relatively neutral congregation, and supportive ministerial peers.[33]

Does this imply that theological and ethical orientations are, in last analysis, unimportant? I have argued in Chapter Two that this is not the case. At the very minimum such attitudes are important in predisposing one to respond ethically when situations arise.

---

[32] See Carlin, Lawyer's Ethics, op. cit., passim; Campbell and Pettigrew, Christians in Racial Crisis; Pope, Millhands and Preachers, op. cit., p. 334; and Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches, pp. 163-207.

[33] Ibid., pp. 168-179.

Also, they are important in a more negative sense in understanding the internal strain and conflict which persons experience when internalized attitudes and structural constraints pull in opposite directions.

This observation leads to a final finding which may be presented briefly. Near the end of the preceding chapter, I referred to a measure of ministerial morale. Interestingly, when this scale was correlated with the ethical orientation scale, the correlation was -.27 ($p < .01$). While this is not a strong correlation, it nevertheless indicates a negative association between a contextualist ethic and high morale. There are several possible reasons for this, including the one discussed in the preceding paragraph. That is, the contextualist was found generally to be rather liberal in his attitude on various social issues. If he were liberal without feeling free to act on the basis of his liberalism, there would likely be a morale problem growing out of the strain and conflict of the situation.

This is not the only possible reason for the finding regarding morale. The difference may also be associated with the previous discussion concerning the minister as moral counselor. It was suggested that the principles oriented minister, basing his counsel on more or less fixed principles, would have a greater sense of security and authority in fulfilling this role than his contextually oriented counterpart. The latter, while less constrained by having to apply traditional moral principles in a rapidly changing society, may be also less secure in this role and have less professional authority in the eyes of his parishioners. This possible difference between the two types of ministers may also account for a part of the morale situation.

Both of the above interpretations, although plausible, are only inferences and are not firmly supported conclusions. What cannot be denied is that morale is obviously a problem for a number of these clergymen. More attention will be devoted to this issue in the following chapter, but it is a question that needs considerably more attention than is possible in this study.

To summarize all of the findings of this chapter would be too tedious and involved. The principal findings, however, are that seminary social climates do explain a portion of the variation in social-ethical perspectives, including attitudes towards the principles-contextual debate, attitudes concerning the church's involvement in social issues, and attitudes on specific social issues such as civil rights. In general, the Religious Community and Vocational School graduates are more likely to ascribe to a principles orientation and to relatively more conservative positions on the other measures used. The various correlations between the scales, including the morale scale, help to give meaning to the principles-contextual discussion as well as raising several other important issues. Before reflecting further on the implications of these findings and the issues raised for theological education, it is first necessary to consider one further dimension of the "professional self" into which the minister is socialized--his basic image of ministry. This discussion will round out the picture being drawn here, and will help to sharpen further some of the issues that have been raised.

CHAPTER IX

SOCIAL CLIMATE AND IMAGE OF MINISTRY

> The problem of the minister . . . is to develop an image of himself that is congenial with his theological orientation, that adequately explains his function in the church, and that permits him to be related effectively to all personnel in the social system.
>
> -- Samuel W. Blizzard[1]

The quotation from Samuel Blizzard's research on ministerial roles emphasizes the importance of a third dimension of the point of view of professional self into which ministers are socialized. It is the image of ministry[2] which the clergyman holds and which becomes the basis of his self-concept or identity. The image of ministry also potentially provides a frame of reference for the organization of the minister's work and for adjudicating between different role expectations. And, finally, the image of ministry is potentially important as the image or self-concept which the minister presents to others in his various role relationships.

---

[1] "The Parish Minister's Self-Image of His Master Role," p. 26.

[2] I have chosen to refer to the dimension I am considering as the minister's image of ministry rather than as his "master role" and "integrating roles" as Blizzard does in his research. See Ibid., and also Samuel W. Blizzard, "The Protestant Minister's Integrating Roles," Religious Education, LIII (July-August, 1958), pp. 374-380. It did not seem necessary for the purposes of this research to make the distinction which Blizzard makes between master role and integrating roles. Both that which is distinctive about ministry as compared with other occupations (master role) and the goals or objectives of ministry (integrating roles) are implied by image of ministry as it is used here.

Just as ministers differ in theological orientation and social ethical perspective, so also do they differ in their image of ministry. It is the concern of this chapter to examine the way in which theological education influences (or perhaps fails to influence) the internalization of an image of ministry. It is obvious that the seminary one attends is by no means the only source of an image of ministry. To repeat in more extended fashion a previously cited reference from Blizzard:

> A person who becomes a minister begins to form his image of the clergyman relatively early in life. His socialization into the profession was initiated when he first heard a person called 'Reverend' or recognized a person as a minister. All of his experiences and interactions with the clergy prior to ordination helped him derive an image of the ministry and perhaps of himself professionally as a minister. His call to be a clergyman, his theological education and his ordination are additional stages in his professional socialization. Ordination is his formal initiation into the profession, and the ceremony will in part confirm his image of himself as minister. Post-ordination experiences contribute to the maturation of his self-image as minister. He will be testing out role models that have been an inspiration for him or that his teachers have described. In addition, he will have derived by trial and error new facets for his own role image. The problem of the minister is to bring all of these images, his own and that of others, into sharp and acceptable focus.[3]

This cogent overview of the entire process is a sharp reminder that many sources feed the image of ministry which a person internalizes, and furthermore, as Blizzard makes clear, one's image of ministry need not be static. Therefore, to focus on seminary influences in the development of an image of ministry is only to consider one small but nevertheless important influence along the way. Before turning to this primary concern with the influence of seminary on images of ministry, I wish first to consider in a little more detail several of the reasons why the image of ministry seems to be an important dimension of the point of view or professional self into which the clergyman is socialized.

---

[3] "The Parish Minister's Self-Image of His Master Role," p. 27.

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF IMAGES OF MINISTRY

First, the minister's image of ministry is likely to be a central aspect of the minister's basic self-concept or personal identity. Occupational statuses and roles in an industrial society generally are important for the self-concepts of the individuals who are their incumbents; however, the degree to which this is the case probably varies from occupation to occupation. Given the high degree of occupational specialization in modern society, some occupations are so specialized as to be "invisible" and/or relatively unknown to the general public. The temporal and spatial segregation of work from other life contexts also contributes to the "invisibility" and lack of knowledge about some jobs. The less visible and/or well known an occupation is to the general public, the less likely it is to be the basis for a meaningful identity or self-concept. In addition, there are some occupational statuses and roles which involve less of the "whole person" -- physically, mentally, emotionally and temporally --

than others.[4] Such occupations would also be less likely to be a basic aspect of one's identity than occupations which involve more of the whole person.

Professions (especially the more traditional ones of law, medicine and ministry) tend to be highly visible and generally well known (although not always understood), and they tend to involve more of the total person than do most other occupations. The discussion in Chapter Two of professional socialization as status as well as role socialization implied this more diffuse nature of many professional occupations. Indeed, for some professions -- e.g., the Roman Catholic priest -- the professional status is well-nigh total.[5] In such a case, one's self-concept and one's occupational status are likely to stand almost in one-to-one correlation.[6] The Protestant minister's professional status is rarely so total as his Catholic counterpart; nevertheless, its relative diffuseness is reflected in a recent humorously serious book on the Protestant ministry which refers to the minister as "the professional family man" and as "condemned to sin piously."[7] Therefore, it is probably true that for most ministers, Protestant as well as Catholic, their image of ministry is likely to be an important and basic aspect of their general self-concept or sense of identity. There may be, as suggested above, almost one-to-one correlation between the two.[8] This being the case, it is important to give attention to the minister's socialization into an image of ministry. An adequate image of ministry (and at present I will not attempt to specify the meaning of "adequate"), which provides a meaningful sense of identity, is a crucial aspect in effective interpersonal and professional functioning. As Nelson Foote has expressed it, "Faith in one's conception of one's self is the key which unlocks the physiological resources of the human organism . . . ." Likewise, "doubt of identity, or confusion, where it does not cause complete disorientation, certainly drains action of its meaning, and thus limits mobilization of the organic correlates of emotion, drive, and energy."[9]

---

[4] See the comparative analysis of occupational roles in various industrial settings by Robert Blauner, Alienation and Freedom (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

[5] See J. D. Donovan, "The Catholic Priest: A Study in the Sociology of the Professions" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1951).

[6] It is interesting to read Graham Greene's novel, The Power and the Glory (New York: The Viking Press, 1962), in this light. The struggle of the person of the priest against his status-role as priest provides important insight into the point under consideration. Similarly, yet with the reverse effects, the Italian revolutionary Spina finds his identity altered by the role he assumed as he posed as Don Paolo, a Catholic priest, in Ignazio Silone's novel, Bread and Wine (New York: Signet Books, 1946).

---

[7] Daniel D. Walker, The Human Problems of the Minister (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960).

[8] The identification of one's self more or less totally with a role raises, of course, very serious moral questions regarding an individual's accountability for his behavior. The Adolph Eichmann case, in which Eichmann denied responsibility for his actions, claiming instead that he was only fulfilling his role expectations, is a classic example of the surrender of moral accountability as an individual to a social role. For a discussion of the "bad faith" which such behavior involves, see Peter Berger, The Precarious Vision (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1951), pp. 85 ff.

Closely related to this first reason for the importance of an image of ministry -- as is also true for other professions -- is a second. It is probably true that for everyone, at one time or another, competing and sometimes conflicting role expectations are experienced. When this happens, one must find some way of handling the ensuing strain and/or conflict. One possibility is through the compartmentalization -- temporally and/or spatially -- of role performances. Another possibility is through establishing a hierarchy of importance to enable one to adjudicate between the competing or conflicting demands.[10] It is the latter solution which is made possible, potentially, by one's image of ministry as it functions as a criterion on the basis of which rival claims are adjudicated and a hierarchy of importance established. I must emphasize, however, the word potential. Blizzard's research, like that of Campbell and Pettigrew, makes clear that one's image of ministry or self-concept is often outflanked or overwhelmed by competing rival claims. As one of Blizzard's most widely cited findings indicates, the practitioner roles which the ministers emphasize as most important normatively are rarely the practitioner roles which claim the majority of their time.[11] Thus, one's image of ministry does not always suffice as an ordering principle to prevent role strain or conflict. This does not imply that the image of ministry is, therefore unimportant. As I emphasized in an earlier chapter, values and normative standards are not made irrelevant by failure to live up to them. Indeed, the fact that one's normative image of ministry is over-ruled by competing role expectations may in itself be the occasion for severe role strain or conflict, as the various previously cited studies have indicated.

---

[9] "Identification as the Basis For a Theory of Motivation," American Sociological Review, XVI (February, 1951), pp. 18-19. See also Nelson Foote and Leonard S. Cottrell, Identity and Interpersonal Competence (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955).

[10] Considerable literature on role conflicts and role strain exists, including a number of studies of clergymen. One of the most helpful general treatments of role strain is by William Goode, "Towards a Theory of Role Strain," American Sociological Review, XXV (August, 1960), pp. 483-496. For some of the studies especially concerned with role conflicts of ministers, see Campbell and Pettigrew, "Racial and Moral Crisis," op. cit., pp. 509-516; Waldo Burchard, "Role Conflicts of the Military Chaplains," American Sociological Review, XIX (1954), pp. 528-535; Bryan R. Wilson, "The Pentecostalist Minister: Role Conflicts and Status Contradictions," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (1958-59), pp. 494-504; and Samuel W. Blizzard, "The Minister's Dilemma," The Christian Century, (April 25, 1956), pp. 508-509.

Finally, in addition to providing a basis for a self-concept and a principle by which, potentially, one may order competing and conflicting role expectations, the image of ministry also functions as the self-concept in terms of which one presents himself to others in various role relationships. This is especially true in role relationships that are more or less explicitly professional; however, given the diffuse nature of the minister's professional status, the minister's image of ministry probably is involved in his presentation of self in extra-professional roles as well. I am here concerned with the image of ministry which the minister wants and intends for members of his role set[12] to have concerning him in their role relations. To put it in terms of Erving Goffman's dramaturgical perspective (which probably errs in attributing too much rational calculation to actors in everyday interaction), the minister wants to manage or control the definition of the situation in which he presents himself to others.[13] He wants them to perceive him in terms of a particular image of ministry which fits his self-concept rather than according to some other image or stereotype which they might bring to the interaction. This is especially true as the minister goes to a new parish or other setting for ministry. He attempts at the outset to define himself--his image and style of ministry--to the people, perhaps in distinction from what he understood his predecessor's image to have been. Not only at the beginning, but throughout his ministry, the clergyman continues to convey, consciously or unconsciously, an image of ministry in terms of which he would have others to understand and relate to him.

---

[11] Ibid., p. 509.

---

[12] I am using "role set," following Robert Merton, to mean "that complement of role-relationships in which persons are involved by virtue of occupying a particular social status." "The Role-Set: Problems in Sociological Theory," _British Journal of Sociology_, VIII (June, 1957), pp. 106-120.

[13] _The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life_ (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959), p. 1. Oliver Reid Whitley, _Religious Behavior_ (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), pp. 159-167, has helpfully applied Goffman's dramaturgical approach to the ministry in more detail than is warranted here.

Unfortunately, the minister is not always able to control the image which others have of him in the role relationship. As Goffman makes clear, the self-conception which one presents is only one of a number of factors in the situation of interaction. The stage--props, scenery and all--on which the interaction occurs is also an important factor in the interaction, as are the stereotypes and past experiences which one's audience (role set) brings to the interaction.[14] The fact that ministers are not always successful in controlling the image of ministry which they would have others hold of them is a source of considerable distress for many ministers. The _McCall's_ magazine survey of ministers emphasized this dilemma:

> Young ministers were especially preoccupied by the problem of their role and image. They talked about "identity" and smarted under what they believed to be the secular world's view of themselves and their role. They feel lonely, and long to be "honest and authentic human beings." "The image bothers me. I'm a nice guy, and the image forces me to remain so. I want to raise hell, I want to _be_ something," said a forty-year-old Episcopalian priest in an urban Kentucky church.[15]

The quotation reveals not only the minister's frustration with being expected to be "on stage" at all times--the diffuse status problem--but also a frustration with the kind of image of ministry which members of his role set impute to him. While at times there is no problem--the minister and his role set agree on their definitions --there are many cases like the one cited which cause a serious morale problem for ministers. I will return to this problem below. Suffice it to say at present that, whether the minister's own self-definition or that which others impute to him prevails, the self-image he attempts and intends to convey to his role set is important to take into consideration.

---

[14] See Goffman, _The Presentation of Self_, _op_. _cit_., pp. 1 ff.

[15] Ardis Whitman, "The View from the Pulpit," _McCall's_, _op_. _cit_., p. 145.

II. EXPRESSIVE AND INSTRUMENTAL IMAGES

Having considered several of the reasons for the importance of the clergyman's image of ministry, I turn now to the problem of conceptualizing images of ministry and to the way in which the conceptualizations were translated into working definitions for the purposes of this study.

There is, in last analysis, probably no one way which is necessarily the "best" way that images of ministry may be defined. Perhaps the most prevalent way of defining them has been to draw on the various traditional--usually biblical--categories used to describe ministry in different ways throughout the history of the church. Thus, ministry is defined variously under the images of priest, prophet, servant, pastor, etc. An alternative to this typical way of defining images of ministry is to attempt to define a more general dimension in terms of which the various historic (and more contemporary) images may be ordered. The latter approach has been chosen here because it allows for a more parsimonious ordering, and also because it more easily permits comparison across professional lines. The latter concern is important, not only for the general comparative analysis of professions, but because it allows for a clearer assessment of the ministry as a profession in relation to other professions.[16] As I indicated in Chapter One, the dimension on which I have chosen to conceptualize images of ministry is what I am calling an expressive-instrumental continuum.

This distinction between expressive and instrumental has been used in a variety of ways and contexts.[17] In their polar or extreme forms, the adjectives are likely to be inappropriate for describing images of ministry.[18] Rather, it is probably more correct to consider images of ministry as falling at various locations on a continuum somewhere between the two polar extremes. This qualification should be kept in mind in the discussion of the meaning of the continuum as it is used in the study and in the presentation of the data.

---

[16] A further benefit of a more general way of conceptualizing images of ministry which is not immediately the concern of this study is that it allows for taking into account new forms of ministry which do not conform to older, more traditional images. For a discussion of this problem, see Philip R. Phenix, "A Functional Approach to the Understanding of Ministry," Theological Education, IV (Autumn, 1967), pp. 528-541. See especially pp. 534-535.

[17] See, for example, Talcott Parsons, The Social System (New York: The Free Press, 1951), pp. 48-49; 69-89; and passim. Also, see Amitai Etzioni, Complex Organizations, pp. 142 ff.

[18] I make this qualification without any real certainty of its accuracy; however, it seems unlikely that the polar extremes of the continuum, which will be defined below, are likely to be found among ministers in the Judaeo-Christian, Protestant tradition. Neither pure "being" (expressive) nor pure "doing" (instrumental) seems

Expressive is generally used to connote a concern with present being, with feeling, with a quality of life in the "now." On the other hand, there is generally meant by instrumental (as the word implies) a description of that which is a means or an instrument for the attainment of an end. Whereas expressive action is, in the extreme case, an end completely in itself, the polar type of instrumental action is not an end, but only a means to an end. The end for the latter is not in the present but in the future, or at least in that which transcends the present.

These general definitions need further to be specified in their relation to images of ministry (and to other professions as well). The highly expressive image of ministry (or at least relatively highly expressive) gives emphasis to the quality of the minister's life, to his distinctive mode of being in relation to God, to his exemplary character as a homo religiosus. Joachim Wach's description of the saint as one whose "prestige depends not so much

---

wholly viable as an image of ministry in this tradition; rather, the images are likely to fall somewhere between the extremes.

on his personal achievement as upon his personal nature and character" which is "wholly determined by his basic religious experience," conveys the meaning of the extreme expressive image of ministry.[19] Likewise, Max Weber's ideal typical "exemplary prophet"--who, by his personal example, demonstrates to others the way to religious salvation. . . recommending to them the same path as he has traversed"[20]--also conveys something of an expressive image of ministry.

Moving from ideal types to more or less concrete examples, one can cite the Hassidic rebbe as illustrating a relatively extreme expressive image of ministry from the Jewish tradition. Solomon Poll describes the rebbe as "an exemplary symbol of religiosity" who is "engaged in leading and directing the members toward the 'way of righteousness'" and who has a "monopoly over religious values."[21] In the Christian tradition, several of the more traditional integrative roles which Samuel Blizzard identified empirically in his research on clergymen also illustrate a relatively expressive image of ministry--e.g., the "believer-saint" (the man of faith who humbly seeks God's will), the "father-shepherd" (the man of unshakeable faith in whose presence God is near), and, in varying degrees, the

---

[19] Joachim Wach, The Sociology of Religion (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944), p. 358. (Emphasis supplied.)

[20] The Sociology of Religion, op. cit., p. 55

[21] Solomon Poll, The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.), pp. 125-127.

"scholar" (whose search for truth is more or less an end in itself), the "liturgist" (for whom the celebration of liturgy is an end in itself) and the "evangelist" (with his concern to save souls through his preaching and his example).[22] Finally, a statement made by a recent seminarian (which was converted into an item in the questionnaire for this study) may be cited as a relatively highly expressive image of ministry:

> It is conceivable that men might enter a seminary for any number of reasons. For some it is primarily a matter of settling upon a profession or career; others are motivated by higher ends: the desire to save souls, witness to the gospel, or help one's fellow man . . . .
>
> For myself none of the above constituted the primary reason for entering seminary. I am here above all because I feel that I have a true vocation to the _state of life_ for which this will prepare me.
>
> . . . It is God who calls each of us to a _particular state_ of life and it is up to us to respond, either by accepting or rejecting it.[23]

---

[22] Blizzard, "The Protestant Parish Minister's Integrating Roles," pp. 376-377. A recent spoof of the ministry from within the profession parodies the expressive image of ministry as follows: "Perhaps the best single word to describe the flavor of personality one must strive to achieve is pious. This implies that the preacher will gather up in himself a host of qualities and characteristics and distill them into an essence which he exudes at all times, and which advertizes unmistakably that here is a man of much prayer and meditation and lofty thoughts, a man who has disentangled himself from the secular, soiling concerns which obsess most men--in short, a clergyman." Charles Merrill Smith, _How to Become a Bishop Without Being Religious_ (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1965), pp. 2-3.

[23] Raymond Q. Dalton, "A Matter of Vocation," _Why I Am at the Seminary_, Thomas W. Wersell, ~~editor~~ (Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Press, 1962), p. 30. (Emphasis supplied)

In contrast to expressive images of ministry, instrumental images have in common an emphasis on doing rather than being, on function rather than form. Ministry is primarily something that one does--functions that one performs to accomplish specific purposes--rather than something that one is.[24] In his being as Christian, the minister is no different from the layman. The minister's authority as a professional lies in his specialized knowledge and skills which allow him to perform necessary tasks within the church and society; however, it is this special competence rather than any personal qualities which set him apart from the laity. Towards the laity, he defines himself as primus inter pares, using his special competence as a professional to enable or facilitate the laity in their life and mission as Christians.

Earlier, I referred to Weber's ideal type of the exemplary prophet as an example of an expressive image of ministry. I am not so certain that the ideal type of ethical prophet is a clear example of an extreme instrumental image of ministry, given Weber's emphasis on the charisma of the prophet. Nevertheless, it seems clear that

---

[24] Although he principally uses the term "functional" rather than instrumental to describe ministry, Philip R. Phenix combines the terms and the essential meaning which I wish to convey: "Ministry is instrumental. It is a means to an end other than itself. Functionalism is the insistence on justification by services rendered as opposed to fixation on patterns of activity as ends in themselves." "A Functional Approach to the Understanding of Ministry," op. cit., p. 538. For another use of "functional" to describe images of ministry, see Hartshorne and Froyd, Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention, op. cit., p. 55.

the ethical prophet, described as "an instrument for the proclamation of God and his will," falls more on the instrumental than the expressive side of the continuum.[25] Other examples of images of ministry which give major emphasis to the instrumental dimension are to be found in several of the various contemporary integrative roles which emerged from the data of Blizzard's study: the "interpersonal relations specialist" (with his psychological orientation and concern to enable human personality to function more effectively); the "parish promoter" (the organizer and administrator whose concern is to enable the organization of the church to function effectively); the "community problem solver" (whose concern is the more effective functioning of the community or of society according to some sacred or secular ideology); the "educator" (who is concerned with facilitating the Christian education of the congregation); and the "subcultural specialist" (who has special skills for ministry to some segment of society such as the campus, the inner city, rural areas, etc.).[26] What seems to be common to these various more specifically designated integrative roles is the image of the minister as more or less of an instrument to facilitate the attainment of a certain end or ends. For this reason, it seems possible to subsume them under the more general heading of instrumental images, in contrast to those previously cited as more expressively oriented.

---

[25] Max Weber, The Sociology of Religion, op. cit., p. 55.

[26] Blizzard, "The Protestant Parish Minister's Integrating Roles," pp. 377-380.

As I indicated above, in addition to allowing for a more parsimonious ordering of various historic and contemporary images of ministry along a continuum, the use of the more general dimension makes possible cross-professional comparisons. While the comparative study of professions is not the basic purpose of this research, it is possible, I believe, to use the expressive-instrumental dimension fruitfully to compare images of ministry with other professional and occupational images. Janowitz's distinction between professional soldiers who are "heroic leaders who embody traditionalism and glory, and military 'managers', who are concerned with the scientific and rational conduct of war,"[27] seems to be interpretable in terms of the expressive-instrumental contrast. Likewise, even in so instrumental a context as business, there may be some justification for seeing expressive elements in the "classical" image of business executives compared with the more instrumental "managerial" image.[28] And, finally, perhaps it is not entirely incorrect to view the medical profession as having both expressive and instrumental images, even if the predominant emphasis is upon the instrumental. The traditional general practitioner, for example, has been characterized in terms that convey elements of a more expressive image in contrast to the instrumental image of the specialist,[29] and Parsons has called attention to factors in the practice of medicine that call for the expressive symbols in spite of the dominant emphasis on the instrumental.[30]

---

[27] Morris Janowitz, The Professional Soldier (New York: The Press of Glencoe, 1960), p. 21. See Robert Lovell, "The Professional Socialization of the West Point Cadet," pp. 122-123, for a use of Janowitz's types in an empirical study of the socialization of military officers.

[28] See Francis X. Sutton, Seymour E. Harris, Carl Kaysen, and James Tobin, The American Business Creed (New York: Schocken Books, 1962), pp. 33-36. The authors do not use the expressive-instrumental distinction, and the types include other dimensions as well; however, I do not believe it wrong to detect something of the expressive-instrumental distinction in this description. Similarly, the two plant managers in Gouldner's study of the mining company convey the contrast between expressive and instrumental images of leadership. See Alvin W. Gouldner (ed.), Studies in Leadership: Leadership and Democratic Action (New York: Harper & Row, 1950), pp. 644-659.

Although, as I have emphasized, it is not my purpose to engage here in a comparative study of the professions, these references to other professions call attention to the possible comparative value of the expressive-instrumental dimension. In addition, although I did not deal with it explicitly, there is a further implication of these cross-professional references. In each of the above examples (as also was the case in most of the examples cited as illustrations of expressive and instrumental images of ministry), there is a tendency for the expressive professional image to reflect more traditional orientations within various professions, and for the instrumental image to represent more contemporary professional images. In modern society, the professional model is highly esteemed, and a considerable number of occupational groups aspire to professional status. However, the professional model which is generally highly valued is one which exhibits a high degree of functional rationality, technical competence, and scientific knowledge.[31] It is these achieved (performance) characteristics rather than ascribed (qualitative) characteristics on which the relatively high evaluation of professionals is based; or, in terms of the categories of this study, evaluation of professionals is based on instrumental rather than on expressive criteria. To put it crudely--and there are notable exceptions--technical competence seems to be valued in contemporary professionals more highly than godliness; although, a person is doubly blessed if he has both.

---

[29] See Ronald Bodley Scott, "The Doctor in Contemporary Literature," The Lancet, 269 (August 13, 1955), pp. 341-343, reprinted in Vollmer and Mills (eds.), Professionalization, op. cit., pp. 114-119.

[30] Parsons, The Social System, pp. 433, 450 ff.

If this line of reasoning is correct, then an instrumental image of the ministry is a more "professional" image--in terms of current standards--than is an expressive image, which may have been more highly esteemed in an earlier period. I do not mean this as an indivious or a normative distinction; rather, I suggest that it is more or less a "given" of the contemporary situation. Also, I suggest that it has some rather important implications for theological education and ministry, which will be considered at appropriate points below.

---

[31] See Talcott Parsons, "The Professions and Social Structure," in Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory, revised edition (New York: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 34-49.

Given the definition of the expressive-instrumental continuum discussed above, a scale to measure images of ministry was constructed from several items in the follow-up questionnaire. The items contained statements concerning ministry which had been judged to be expressive or instrumental. It was suggested to the respondents that these items represented images of ministry indicative of ways in which ministers might define the major purpose of their ministry. They were asked to express the degree of importance of each statement for their own definition of their ministry.[32]

Before turning to the major hypotheses and data analysis, it may be instructive briefly to examine the product-moment correlations between the image of ministry scale and several other ministerial role scales which were available in the Danforth Study. It would be too involved and, perhaps, unnecessary to go into a description of each scale, except to indicate that each is so constructed as to represent what has been judged to be either a relatively traditional or relatively contemporary ministerial practitioner role. The items

---

[32] See Appendix C for details concerning the scale. The total scores could range from -20 to +20, with the latter representing the extreme instrumental end of the continuum. The distribution was slightly skewed towards the instrumental end, with a mean of 2.3 and a median of 2.0. Where contingency tables are used, the respondents have been grouped into four categories as follows:

Below 0 = Highly Expressive
1 to 3 = Moderately Expressive
4 and 5 = Moderately Instrumental
Above 5 = Highly Instrumental

used listed specific activities in which ministers engage in the practice of their profession. Respondents were asked to indicate either their degree of enjoyment of the activity mentioned or, in some cases, their degree of desire to engage in the activity.[33] Four relatively traditional roles--evangelist, traditional pastor, priest and preacher--were identified, along with four relatively contemporary roles--community leader, administrator, pastoral counselor, and teacher of the congregation. The correlations between the respondents' scores on these scales and their scores on the image of ministry scale help further to interpret the meaning of the expressive-instrumental distinction as defined above. These correlations are given in Table 41. While the correlation coefficients are not strikingly large, it can be seen that the signs are in the direction suggested; that is, an expressive image of ministry is more highly correlated with the four more traditional practitioner roles, and the instrumental image is generally more highly correlated with the more contemporary practitioner roles. Interestingly, the preacher and pastoral counselor roles--one more traditional and the other more contemporary--did not prove highly correlated with one side of the continuum rather than the other. This reflects the considerable importance attached to preaching by most Protestants, regardless of expressive or instrumental orientation. It also probably reflects the rather widespread institutionalization of the more psychologically oriented pastoral counseling (in contrast to traditional pastoral care). In general, then, these correlations help to interpret the meaning of the expressive-instrumental continuum. Furthermore, they tend to support my contention that an instrumental image is a more contemporary image, and, by further inference, that it is also a more "professional" image of ministry in the current usage of the term. These suppositions will be considered further below after the examination of the data regarding seminary influence on images of ministry. The major hypotheses need now to be stated more fully.

---

[33] The items used and their groupings into the various scales are described in Appendix C.

TABLE 41

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN IMAGE OF MINISTRY AND PRACTITIONER ROLES

	Evangelist	Traditional Pastor	Priest	Preacher	Community Leader	Administrator	Pastoral Counselor	Teacher of the Congregation
Image of Ministry**	-.38*	-.27*	-.16*	-.08	.22*	.14	.09	.17*

* $p < .01$

**NOTE: A positive correlation indicates relative agreement with an instrumental image of ministry, while negative correlations indicate relative agreement with expressive images.

III. SEMINARIES AND IMAGES OF MINISTRY

Given the qualitative, and in some instances charismatic, aspects of the expressive self-image, one would expect to find it most highly associated with seminaries which follow the Religious Community and Vocational School models, regardless of the individual perspectives of the graduates. In both of these seminary types, spiritual formation is a salient goal of theological education, regardless of whether spiritual formation stems from the Roman Catholic or Protestant pietist traditions. Since, however, the Vocational School model also places high valuation on the practice of ministry, graduates of such schools are expected to be less expressive than graduates of the Religious Community. Finally, it is expected that the Graduate School model would influence students most strongly towards an instrumental self-definition. Both the emphasis on scholarly research and on engagement with secular thought and institutions would suggest a less qualitative or charismatic approach to ministry. Also, the same structural effects hypotheses as in preceding chapters will be tested with reference to images of ministry. That is, it is predicted that there will be more similarity regarding image of ministry within a given school, controlling for individual perspectives, than there will be for individuals ascribing to similar philosophies of theological education who attended different seminary types. The tests of these hypotheses are summarized in Table 42, which gives the percentage distributions for each school type, and in

Table 43, which gives the Index of Dissimilarity statistics.

TABLE 42

IMAGE OF MINISTRY BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY

Image of Ministry	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Highly Expressive	50.5	35.0	42.5	31.9	23.2	25.2
Mod. Expressive	25.4	30.0	27.7	29.4	27.6	28.0
Mod. Instrumental	12.8	15.5	14.2	14.1	15.7	15.4
Highly Instrumental	11.3	19.6	15.5	24.5	33.5	31.4
Total	48.5	51.5	100.0	23.0	77.0	100.0
N =	(390)	(414)	(804)	(163)	(547)	(710)

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
Highly Expressive	31.4	35.0	33.6	43.3	32.4	34.6
Mod. Expressive	43.1	26.4	32.8	26.7	26.8	26.8
Mod. Instrumental	10.8	17.2	14.7	13.4	15.1	14.7
Highly Instrumental	14.7	21.5	18.9	16.6	25.6	23.9
Total	38.5	61.5	100.0	19.8	80.2	100.0
N =	(102)	(163)	(265)	(247)	(1002)	(1249)

	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
Highly Expressive	13.1	21.8	18.2	25.3	42.7	40.4
Mod. Expressive	19.6	28.9	25.1	30.7	28.6	28.9
Mod. Instrumental	19.0	14.6	16.5	16.7	13.7	14.1
Highly Instrumental	48.2	34.7	40.3	27.3	14.9	16.6
Total	41.3	58.7	100.0	13.6	86.4	100.0
N =	(168)	(239)	(407)	(150)	(957)	(1107)

TABLE 43

INDEX OF DISSIMILARITY OF IMAGE OF MINISTRY
BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY (BASED ON TABLE 42)

A. Dissimilarity Between School Types

	D =
Religious Community - Vocational School	.09
Religious Community - Graduate School	.27
Vocational School - Graduate School	.23

B. Dissimilarity Within School Types

	D =
Religious Community	.15
Vocational School	.17
Graduate School	.21

C. Dissimilarity Between Those with Similar Philosophies, But Graduates of Different Schools

	D =
Tradition/Spiritual	.19
Practical/Spiritual	.16
Tradition/Secular	.23

Looking first at the differences between schools (the totals column for the left table under each type of school), it can be seen that 29.7% of the graduates of the Religious Community type, 33.6% of those from the Vocational School type, and 56.8% of those from the Graduate School type defined themselves in one of the two instrumental categories. Or, considering the dissimilarity between the graduates of the schools, the proportions of respondents who would have had to define their ministry differently to have made for no differences between the seminary types are a low .09 between the Religious Community and Vocational School, .23 between the Vocational School and Graduate School, and .27 between the Religious Community and the Graduate School. There is, then, little overall dissimilarity between the first two types with reference to images of ministry. However, closer inspection of the table reveals that there are differences between the two types of schools in the distributions of the two expressive categories, especially among those whose philosophies are congruent with the respective school types. That is, five out of ten men who are Tradition/Spiritual in the Religious Community are highly expressive, while only three out of ten Practical/Spiritual men are highly expressive in the Vocational School. There, the moderately expressive category represents the dominant image of ministry. In fact, looking down the table in the first column for each school (which represents those whose personal philosophies are congruent with their school type), a distinct modal image of ministry is evident for each school. For the Religious Community it is the highly expressive image; for the Vocational School it is the moderately expressive; and for the Graduate School it is the highly instrumental.

Having considered the differences between schools, it is also necessary to examine the effects of social climate within each type of school. The hypothesis, it will be recalled, is a prediction of more homogeneity in images of ministry within each type of school, regardless of personal philosophy of theological education, than between those holding similar personal philosophies but who attended different types of schools. Looking first at the Index of Dissimilarity (Table 43), it appears that the hypothesis is only weakly supported if it is supported at all. That is, the dissimilarity within each type of school between those holding congruent philosophies and those with other ("deviant") philosophies is only slightly greater than the dissimilarity between those with similar philosophies but who are graduates of different types of schools. In one case--the Vocational School--the within-school dissimilarity is greater by .01 than that between Practical/Spiritual men in different types of schools. Recalling similar comparisons on theological orientations and social-ethical perspectives, there was considerably more evidence of structural effects in these cases than in the case of images of ministry.

However, the Index of Dissimilarity in this case is too gross a measure. That is, while it accurately summarizes overall differences of proportions in the comparisons made, it does not reveal some of the finer distinctions in the percentage distributions in Table 42. When these distributions are considered, the structural effects hypothesis receives slightly more support. Looking at the left hand column in each of the two panels of the table (e.g., "Religious Community" and "Other") for the three school types, and comparing the modal image of ministry for each school type, the structural effects of social climate are somewhat more evident. For those with Tradition/Spiritual perspectives, there is a difference of 18.6% between those who attend Religious Community Schools and those in other types. The moderately expressive Practical/Spiritual men in the Vocational School are different by 16.4% from their peers in other schools, and those with the Tradition/Secular philosophy differ from each other by 20.9% on the highly instrumental category. Nevertheless, in spite of these differences, when the above percentage differences are compared with the percentage differences within each type of school (e.g., between Tradition/Spiritual and others in the Religious Community, etc.), there is relatively little difference between the two sets of figures, as the Index of Dissimilarity had previously revealed. Thus, there is not more homogeneity on images of ministry within school types than there is between those who hold similar philosophies in different types of schools. The distributions are relatively similar.

In summary, there are significant differences when the differences of images of ministry between schools are compared, and these differences are in the direction hypothesized. There are also differences in images of ministry between those who ascribe to similar philosophies of theological education, but who attend different types of schools. Those whose philosophies are congruent with the school types are more likely to hold the type of image of ministry expected to be associated with the school type than are their counterparts in other types of schools. However, the effects of the social climate are not so strong on those who are "deviants" with reference to personal philosophy in each of the school types. Thus, the structural effects hypothesis is only partially supported.

Having considered the major hypotheses, I turn now, as in the two preceding chapters, to a brief consideration of additional variables which need to be taken into account. Table 44 summarizes the effects of these variables in abbreviated form. Only the combined percentages of the two instrumental categories are given, and differences in individual philosophies are ignored. The variables considered include, in addition to those controlled for in the preceding chapters, two others--father's occupation and type of field education--which are potentially important for the development of one's image of ministry.

As before, the first question to be asked is whether or not the control variables render the relation between seminary type and image of ministry spurious. It can readily be seen that there are a number of cases where these additional variables call into question the previously demonstrated linear relation of increasing proportions of instrumental images as one moves from Religious Community to Vocational School to Graduate School. Indeed, there is only one sub-table that does not contain at least one exception to a linear relation. What are the possible implications of these findings?

Of course, the most obvious implication is that the relation previously discovered between images of ministry and type of seminary is spurious. It is "washed out" by the various control variables.

TABLE 44

PERCENT INSTRUMENTAL ON IMAGES OF MINISTRY BY SEMINARY TYPE AND SELECTED VARIABLES

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Total Percent Instrumental	29.7	(239)	33.6	(89)	56.8	(231)
Father's SES						
Low	24.6	(67)	22.2	(10)	52.3	(34)
Moderately Low	33.5	(58)	29.2	(21)	52.9	(56)
Moderately High	28.1	(57)	37.6	(26)	54.1	(52)
High	36.7	(57)	40.5	(32)	63.6	(89)
Father's Occupation						
Professional	34.4	(31)	42.8	(15)	63.9	(55)
Clergy	24.2	(30)	39.5	(15)	43.1	(19)
White Collar	38.3	(89)	32.3	(41)	57.6	(98)
Blue Collar	24.9	(45)	30.3	(13)	55.3	(47)
Farm	24.9	(44)	22.7	(5)	54.5	(12)
Denomination						
Methodist	40.7	(70)	29.8	(47)	54.6	(66)
Presbyterian	39.3	(31)	33.3	(9)	62.7	(124)
Baptist	24.4	(10)	-	-	53.2	(13)
Missouri Synod Lutheran	14.2	(20)	-	-	-	-
Episcopal	23.5	(12)	41.6	(32)	38.1	(21)
American Lutheran	29.9	(94)	-	-	-	-
Decision Group						
Normal	29.8	(200)	34.7	(68)	58.5	(193)
Late	30.6	(37)	31.3	(46)	49.3	(36)
Seminary Preference						
1st Choice	28.2	(202)	32.7	(70)	56.9	(206)
2nd Choice	42.2	(35)	37.8	(17)	55.6	(25)

TABLE 44 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community		Vocational School		Graduate School	
	%	N=	%	N=	%	N=
Peer Perspective						
Tradition/Spiritual	25.7	(86)	22.7	(15)	45.9	(34)
Practical/Spiritual	25.3	(52)	28.7	(24)	42.2	(19)
Tradition/Secular	38.7	(53)	51.2	(22)	62.2	(120)
Practical/Secular	46.8	(36)	41.2	(21)	63.7	(35)
Seminary Housing						
On-Campus	26.8	(139)	37.8	(62)	55.2	(155)
Off-Campus	35.2	(98)	26.3	(26)	60.5	(72)
Type of Field Education						
Parish	28.9	(196)	35.3	(62)	57.7	(165)
Christian Education	27.6	(24)	37.3	(22)	50.6	(49)
Social Service	57.2	(4)	-	-	85.7	(5)
Institutional Ministry	80.0	(3)	-	-	62.5	(5)
Other	41.7	(5)	-	-	-	-
Seminary Quality						
High	-	-	41.8	(23)	61.5	(155)
Medium	37.4	(126)	37.1	(13)	55.3	(68)
Low	24.2	(121)	29.4	(57)	34.7	(17)
Type Ministry Now						
Parish	28.4	(188)	26.7	(53)	55.1	(162)
Campus/Parish	25.7	(25)	50.0	(20)	47.2	(25)
Campus	59.1	(26)	61.6	(16)	73.4	(44)

This interpretation cannot be ruled out. As I suggested above, the seminary is only one of a number of influences upon one's image of ministry, and it may not be a lasting influence or very important relative to the other influences. Before accepting this interpretation without further question, a counter-argument may be mentioned.

It can be noted that a considerable number of the departures from the expected relationship involve only the Religious Community and Vocational School, and a sizable number of these departures from expectation are so small as to make meaningful interpretation possible. Either there is little difference in the influence of these two types of schools on image of ministry--which is possible given the findings cited earlier in this chapter--or the measures of social climate are not sufficiently discriminating. Furthermore, the previously mentioned smaller size of the Vocational School sample may be contributing to these findings through introducing greater sampling fluctuations. Only further research can indicate which of these possibilities is correct; however, if any is correct, then the influence of seminary on images of ministry is not necessarily spurious.

It must be acknowledged, however, that several of the departures from expectation do have significantly large percentage differences (and a sufficient number of cases in the cells) to make analysis possible. One such case--that involving the control for peer perspectives--is interpretable by means of the more complex tables (see Table 56, Appendix D) from which the summary data of Table 44 are taken. Inspection of this table reveals that the expected linear relation between image of ministry and seminary type holds for those who have personal philosophies congruent with the seminary social climate, regardless of peer group philosophy. However, having a "deviant" personal philosophy and a "deviant" peer group makes it possible to subvert the constraining influence of social climate.

The remaining departures from expectation, however, are not so readily interpretable, except in terms of the previously mentioned speculations about measurement and sampling problems. Sons of white collar fathers and those who lived off campus during the seminary do not conform to expectation. Likewise, the influence of denomination, as was pointed out in preceding chapters, is difficult to interpret. Given these exceptions to the expectations which are not easily explainable, it is not, in last analysis, possible to assert that the relation between seminary social climate and image of ministry is not spurious.[34]

Leaving the question of spuriousness, which cannot be finally answered here, it is now necessary to turn briefly to a consideration of the control variables as they contribute to professional socialization in their own right. Several of the findings deserve comment.

Since image of ministry is the concern of this chapter, it seemed important to control for father's occupation as a source of other occupational images which may potentially influence one's image of ministry. It can be seen that those having professional (non-clergy) fathers score higher on an instrumental image of ministry than those with fathers in any other occupational type. If I am correct in assuming that instrumental criteria are characteristic of many professional roles in modern society, then this finding may indicate that sons of professionals are socialized towards a more instrumental self-image by virtue of having fathers as professional role models. White collar or managerial fathers also seem to influence a more instrumental image in two of the three cases, especially among graduates of the Religious Community. On the other hand, in the Religious Community and Graduate School models, sons of clergy are less likely to define themselves instrumentally than sons of other professionals or white collar workers. It can be inferred from this (although there are no data to support the inference) that clergy sons are more likely to have been socialized in a qualitative religious sense (that is, spiritual formation in the home) than sons of other professional or white collar fathers. Also, given traditional views of the clergyman as a "set-apart," more "spiritual" person, these men likely have had a role model in their fathers who exemplified a more expressive image of ministry.

---

[34] As was the case in the analysis of the data for the preceding chapter, I computed here--also illegitimately--zero order and average within class gammas for Table 42 and the various sub-tables of Table 44. The zero order (between schools) gamma is .34. None of the average within class gammas computed for the various control variables reduced the original relationship to zero. The average within class gamma for denomination is the lowest at .15, and the next lowest is the control for the quality index at .23. These statistics cannot be interpreted as justifying an assertion that the original relation is not spurious. They do, however, give highly limited credence to a belief that methodological rather than substantive matters may lie behind the problematic findings.

As in the two previous chapters, denominational influences are evident. Being a Methodist or Presbyterian, and/or attending a Methodist or Presbyterian seminary of the Religious Community and

Graduate School types increases the likelihood of defining one's ministry instrumentally. Baptists are also considerably more instrumental if they attended the Graduate School model. For the other denominations, however, expressive orientations are dominant. In spite of considerable differences, these denominations--the two Lutheran groups and the Episcopalian--are the more liturgically-oriented denominations in the study with rather clear and "high" doctrines of the office of pastor (Lutheran) and priest (Episcopal).

Among the normal and late deciders for the ministry, the only difference in image of ministry large enough to warrant comment is evident in the Graduate School, where late deciders are less likely to hold an instrumental image. One may speculate that one reason for the relatively higher proportion of expressive images lies in the importance of self-fulfillment--an expressive characteristic--for these men, some of whom have likely been dissatisfied in other occupations.[35]

Seminary preference has considerable effect on the Religious Community graduates who would have preferred another seminary. With less force, this seems also to be the case for the Vocational School men as well. In both types, the more "deviant" instrumental images increase among those who would have preferred to attend a different seminary. Likewise, in all three types of seminaries, peer groups are important factors influencing conformity to or deviation from the dominant ethos. Furthermore, living on or off campus--the measure of the scope of the seminary--also seems to have some bearing on images of ministry. In this latter case, however, the direction of influence is variable. In both the Religious Community and Graduate School, living on campus seems to increase the proportion of expressive images of ministry; whereas, the reverse is true in the Vocational School.

---

[35] See Lindenthal, "Entrance Into the Ministry at Two Points in Life," pp. 284-285.

It was anticipated that, when the type of field education in which students engage was taken into account, there would be significant differences manifest in images of ministry. Ideally, such experiences of practice in ministry occur under the supervision of an experienced practitioner. Whether the ideal is attained or not, and it often is not attained, in his field experience the seminarian is able to try out various ministerial roles, to experience definition by laymen of himself as a minister, and to observe on occasion various potential role models. Such experiences should have an important influence on his image of ministry. Unfortunately the N in types of field education other than parish and various educational ministries was too small to enable reliable interpretation. There is not too much difference between the images of ministry held by those who had experience in parish ministry as opposed to educational ministries. However, while recognizing the danger of generalizing from such small N's, it is tempting to infer that field education experiences of the institutional (hospitals, correctional institutions, etc.), and social service types (YMCA, Youth clubs, inner-city ministries, social action projects, etc.) are quite influential for socialization into instrumental images. Especially in the institutional contexts, students would be exposed to other professionals as potential role models, and in social service activities, "doing" is likely to be more highly valued than "being."[36]

The control for institutional quality reveals an interesting pattern. The higher the seminaries rank on the quality index, the more instrumental the image of ministry of their graduates. This is particularly marked in the Graduate School type, where a difference of over 25% separates the graduates of high and low quality schools. The difference, interestingly, is more than twice the size of the difference between the Religious Community and Graduate School seminaries scoring low on the quality index. Either the higher quality institutions attract men who are already socialized towards a more instrumental (and, perhaps, contemporary) image of ministry, or the factors which were measured and summed into the quality index enhance the acceptance of instrumental images. I suspect that both are true, and that it is the interaction of these variables, along with the social climate, that results in a greater proportion of instrumental images.

---

[36] For fuller consideration of field education experiences, see Edwin L. Becker, "Religious Field Work as Experience in the Social Roles of the Minister; A Sociological Study of the Meaning of Religious Field Work in the Divinity School of Yale University" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, 1956). Also, see J. Christy Wilson (ed.), Ministers in Training, A Review of Field Work Procedures in Theological Education (Princeton: Theological Book Agency, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1957).

Finally, it is evident, as before, that the type of current ministry is highly correlated with one's basic image of ministry. Again, however, the cross-sectional data do not permit a judgment whether a previously internalized self-image influenced the choice of ministry, or whether the reverse was true. In any event, campus ministers, regardless of the type of seminary attended, are more instrumentally oriented than parish ministers. If the difference in setting has its own structural effects, I would suspect that the college or university setting, with its universalistic criteria, its generally rational scientific orientation, and its heavy concentration of other professionals, is more supportive of an instrumental image than the parish, where it is likely that more expressive expectations regarding the minister's role persist.

IV. THE CONSISTENCY OF THE "PROFESSIONAL SELF"

Having considered both the major hypotheses and the additional influence of other potentially important variables on images of ministry, the major aims of this chapter are completed. However, there are two remaining concerns which are of interest in the context of this chapter to which brief attention should be given. One has to do with the intercorrelation of images of ministry with the previously considered theological orientations and social-ethical perspectives.

The other concern has to do with the question of ministerial morale which has already been mentioned at several points above.

The question of the intercorrelations between the three major socialization outcome measures used in the study is a question of the consistency of the point of view into which the clergyman is socialized. To what extent do theological orientations, social-ethical perspectives and images of ministry vary independently of each other, or to what extent do they constitute a more or less consistent gestalt, or frame of reference for professional practice? While some attention has already been given to this above, it is possible now to consider the three measures together, as in Table 45. The correlation coefficients, given the large N, are moderately high, especially for two of the scales. That is, they do indicate that being theologically liberal is generally associated also with being contextual in ethical perspective. Also, one is likely to be instrumental in his image of ministry. There is not, however, the same relative strength of association between being contextual ethically and instrumental in image of ministry. The two tend to vary together, but not to the degree of the other relationships. I have described the correlations in terms of the liberal, contextual and instrumental orientations, since this is the meaning of the positive correlations; however, the same degree of correlation is true for the relative consistency between conservative, principles and expressive orientations. Thus, there is--at least for this sample--a degree of consistency in the general frame of reference from which these men function as ministers. And, to some extent, this consistency is a function of the socialization experience in the seminary, which has been the major concern of this study. The fact, however, that the correlations are no higher than they are does indicate some degree of variability among men and some independence between the three dimensions measured. Socialization into ministry is evidently not a monolithic process.

TABLE 45

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATIONS, SOCIAL-ETHICAL PERSPECTIVES AND IMAGES OF MINISTRY

	Theological Orientation	Social Ethical Perspective	Image of Ministry
Theological Orientation	-	.55	.49
Social-Ethical Perspective		-	.37
Image of Ministry			-

N = 1493
$p < .001$

In addition to the consideration of the question of the consistency of the minister's point of view, there is also the question of ministerial morale, to which brief attention should be given. Already the morale issue has been mentioned in connection with theological certainty and social-ethical perspective; however, it is in relation to image of ministry that the question of morale has special relevance.

Professional morale, as I have defined it for the purposes of this research, is the minister's evaluation of the significance of his profession in modern society.[37] If, as I suggested earlier, one's image of ministry is important for one's basic identity or self-concept, then the relation of professional morale, or of one's evaluation of the significance of his profession, to his image of ministry seems quite important. For example, an individual who receives his basic self-concept or identity from his occupational image, but who also is suffering from low morale regarding the significance of his occupation, is likely to have a rather severe identity crisis. The converse, of course, is also true. The question of interest, however, is whether or not high morale is associated positively or negatively with different images of ministry along the expressive-instrumental continuum. That is, do those who hold a more expressive image of ministry tend to have less of a morale problem than those more instrumentally inclined, or is the reverse true? These questions, furthermore, are of considerable importance with reference to the central interest of this study--that of professional socialization. That is, if one's image of ministry is partly a function of the type of seminary one attended, and if there is a correlation between high or low morale and one's image of ministry, then the influence of theological education is at least indirectly associated also with morale.

---

[37] Howard S. Becker and James Carper, "The Elements of Identification With an Occupation," American Sociological Review, XXI (June, 1956), pp. 341-347, include significance for one's position in the larger society as a component of occupational identity; however, their use of this variable in their analysis is limited primarily to considerations of social class and mobility, which, in my opinion, is not entirely adequate as a working definition of the significance of one's position.

Given the previous speculation regarding instrumental images as being more "professional" according to contemporary usage, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that those with more instrumental images of ministry would have less of a morale problem. That is, such images of ministry would appear to be more congruent with the high social evaluation of functional rationality, technical competence, and scientific knowledge.

To test this hypothesis, the ministers in the sample were asked to give agree-disagree responses (along a six-point scale) to a series of six statements regarding the significance of ministry as a profession.[38] These responses were summed to give each respondent a score on an overall index of professional morale. A product-moment correlation coefficient was then computed between the image of ministry scale and the morale score. Contrary to the hypothesis, the correlation between image of ministry and morale is a $-.43$ ($p < .001$). This is to say that there is a negative, rather than the hypothesized positive, correlation between an instrumental image of ministry and the measure of ministerial morale. When correlation coefficients are computed between the morale scale and the measures of the enjoyment of various ministerial roles, similar negative correlations exist between enjoyment of the more contemporary (more instrumental) roles and the morale scale, as Table 46 reveals. While the correlation coefficients are not large, they clearly suggest that those who express enjoyment of more contemporary roles also are likely to have a morale problem. Conversely--and even more clearly--the more one enjoys traditional (more expressive) roles, the greater the likelihood of having high morale. Thus, in neither case--image of ministry and enjoyment of the various practitioner roles--is the prediction of a positive correlation between high morale and an instrumental image supported.

---

[38] The items used (see Appendix C) were statements taken from articles by ministers and seminary students regarding the church and ministry.

TABLE 46

PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN MINISTERIAL MORALE AND ENJOYMENT OF VARIOUS MINISTERIAL ROLES

	Evangelist	Traditional Pastor	Priest	Preacher	Community Leader	Administrator	Pastoral Counselor	Teacher of the Congregation
Ministerial Morale	.41*	.33*	.20*	.21*	-.13**	-.17*	.33*	-.11**

* $p < .01$
** $p < .05$

What is suggested by these correlations is clearly and poignantly expressed by a minister who scored rather high on the instrumental end of the continuum: "I am almost in complete despair over my function as a minister. If a good 'honest' job were offered to me, I would probably take it."

Before speculating briefly on the "why" of these findings, a parallel finding in a recent study of Roman Catholic seminarians may be mentioned. Potvin and Suziedelis[39] used a scale to measure seminarians' concepts of the priest's role, which they defined along a sacred-secular continuum. While their scale is not directly comparable to the expressive-instrumental dimension used in this study, the similarities are sufficiently great to make some comparisons possible. That is, there are analogues between their sacred dimension and the concept of expressive images used here; likewise, the secular and instrumental categories are similar in conceptualization. Having measured the seminarians' role concepts, the researchers followed up the study one year later with a check on the current enrollment status of their respondents. They found that "those who tend to emphasize the sacred functions and characteristics of the priesthood (e.g., mass, sacraments, holiness, etc.) are more likely to persevere; the withdrawal rate for those who stress the secular functions and characteristics of the priesthood is from two to three times higher."[40] While, to repeat, the measures used are not exactly comparable, there is nevertheless sufficient congruence in the two sets of findings to interpret them as being mutually reinforcing.

---

[39] Raymond H. Potvin and Antanas Suziedelis, "Seminarians of the Sixties," National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, LXV (August, 1969), pp. 44-49.

To return now to speculate on the "why" of these findings, I suspect that there are a variety of possible factors at work which are much too complex to be treated adequately here. I will only briefly mention two factors which, I suggest, are especially important.

The first has to do with the institutional context of the practice of ministry--the church. It is by now a sociological truism to point to the highly differentiated nature of modern society as being one of its distinctive features. The process of socio-cultural differentiation has led to increasing specialization of institutions, and the church has not been unaffected. Without elaborating the point,[41] the effect of differentiation on the church has been to make of it a specialized institution, among other specialized institutions, rather than an institution standing more or less at the center of society, broadly influencing much of the web of social life.[42] Correspondingly, the sphere of influence of the minister has been altered with the change in the social location of the church. The minister is no longer the parson (the person) in the community. He is the specialist within a specialized institution, with major responsibility for maintaining its internal organizational life.[43] This, in itself, should not necessarily create a morale problem if the clergyman sees his role as an enabler of the laity in their ministry in society, which is, as will be recalled, one important aspect of an instrumental image of ministry. However, it will also be recalled that previous findings indicated that men with instrumental images (and low morale) also tend to be more liberal--and probably also more activist-oriented--on social-ethical issues. That is, they not only want laymen to be involved in ministry within society, but they too desire involvement. Yet, as was considered in the preceding chapter, structural features--the requirements of organizational maintenance, the church's social location, and, no doubt, the expectations of many laymen that the church (and minister) comfort rather than challenge society--militate against involvement by the minister "where the action is." This is clearly expressed by one clergyman respondent in a comment in the margin of his questionnaire: "I am a very 'successful' young minister, envied by many fellow clergymen and respected in the community, but very restless because I feel I'm not 'where the action is,' and am wasting my life and talent." Another commented on the "dehumanization and emasculization (sic) of the present setup." Thus, while the organizational demands of specialized religious institutions, as well as expectations of many laymen, exert pressures in one direction on the instrumentally oriented minister, his own normative orientation tends to push him in the opposite direction. Such a situation of role strain is clearly not conducive to high morale.

---

[40] Ibid., p. 48.

[41] Among various considerations of this process in relation to the church, see Thomas Luckmann, The Invisible Religion (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967); Talcott Parsons, "Christianity and Modern Industrial Society," Sociological Theory, Values, and Sociocultural Change, ed. Edward A. Tiryakian (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963), pp. 33-70; Robert N. Bellah, "Religious Evolution," American Sociological Review, XXIX (June, 1964), pp. 358-374; and Jackson W. Carroll, "Some Insights From Sociology Into History and Historicity," op. cit., pp. 8-13.

---

[42] The parish church standing in the center of the village or town, whether in Europe or New England, symbolizes the more central and pervasive influence that the church has had in the past.

[43] For a fuller treatment of this problem, see Ivan Vallier, "Religious Specialists: Sociological Study," op. cit., pp. 444-453.

A second, and closely related probable reason for the positive association of low morale with the instrumental orientation is bound up with my previous speculation about an instrumental image being a more professional image in contemporary usage. While initially this led me to predict higher morale for this more contemporary image of ministry than for the more traditional expressive image, further reflection on the situation suggests a different interpretation. As I pointed out in Chapter Seven, the knowledge base of the minister, while having a coherence and integrity of its own, is of a somewhat different order from the more empirically grounded, functionally rational, scientific knowledge base of most other contemporary professions. Although a dichotomous distinction between "substantive" and "functional" rationality, such as that which Karl Mannheim has made, is not entirely satisfactory with reference to the professions,[44] I suspect that it is safe to say that the knowledge base and role of the professional minister are more substantively rational than functionally rational. While I do not fully agree with all aspects of the following statement of Vallier, I believe that he has captured this distinction and its implications quite well:

> The simple fact that all religious specialists are focused primarily on the realm of the non-empirical and the religio-ethical absolutes, sets them apart from statesmen, business executives, and doctors. The clergyman lacks a technical body of knowledge which can be applied to the solution of empirical problems. In that sense he cannot practice his profession; instead he must live it. For the most part his knowledge is normative and closed, rather than scientific and open. He interprets while his colleagues in the secular professions prescribe; he tries to give meaning to the event, since he cannot control it.[45]

---

[44] See Karl Mannheim, Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, trans. by Edward Shils (London: Kegan Paul, French, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1940), pp. 53 ff. To oversimplify, substantive rationality is primarily concerned with broad questions of the meaning of events and action in the context of basic values, while functional rationality is more concerned with the efficient choice and application of means to the solution of specific problems. See also Mannheim's parallel discussion (p. 67) of substantive and functional morality.

I suspect that such a sharp dichotomy may be inadequate in application to the professions, since professions, in the contemporary usage to which I have referred, are by no means unconcerned with what Mannheim calls substantive rationality. Indeed, one possible reason for the growing trend towards the professionalization of various occupational groups (apart from the more cynical reason that they desire the high prestige and other rewards accorded to professions) may be a concern that occupational behavior be guided by professional standards which are interpreted to be substantive as well as functional.

[45] Op. cit., p. 453.

Vallier's description fits rather well the expressive image of ministry as it was defined above. For the expressively oriented minister, such limits on his professional role probably would be accepted as legitimate. Furthermore, he is likely to live and work in religious settings and role relationships which are supportive of such a definition of the minister's role. However, the instrumentally oriented clergymen, I suspect, would have a distinct difficulty with these limitations. While he is likely to accept the role of interpreter, or provider of meaning to situations, as being one of several legitimate roles of the clergyman, the dissonance of the historic tradition with the contemporary scientific-technological ethos is likely to cause him considerable problems as interpreter.[46] How does he interpret and give meaning to situations and events in ways that are both relevant to the situation and to his parishioner's experience,[47] and at the same time are faithful to the Christian tradition?

---

[46] The product-moment correlation of the image of ministry scales and the theological certainty scales was a -.37 ($p < .01$). That is, there is a moderately strong negative correlation between an instrumental image of ministry and certainty regarding traditional Christian doctrines.

[47] At the time of his death, the sociologist, W. I. Thomas, was collecting letters to the editors of Yiddish newspapers, which revealed that the editor was coming to replace the rabbi as the definer of situations for many Jewish immigrants to the United States. Their turning to the editor was not necessarily a reflection of a defection from the Jewish faith. Rather it was a reflection of the inability or inadequacy of the rabbi to give helpful guidance to persons facing the new situations and strains of modern urban society. His definitions of the situation, based on traditional wisdom, were often irrelevant,

My impression is that most theological schools, which have operated out of the three traditional models that have been considered in this study, have simply not prepared students to do the kind of interpretation and defining of situations relevant to a rapidly changing society in which the dominant ethos is scientific-technological.[48] I will return to this in the final chapter, but it seems likely that such a situation is not conducive to high morale among instrumentally oriented ministers.

Furthermore, as Vallier points out in the above quotation, the body of knowledge of the clergyman does not lend itself as readily to the practice of the profession as does that of other, more empirically oriented professions. Rather, it is more to be *lived* than practiced. While, again, this may cause no problem for the expressively oriented minister in his concern for *being*, the instrumentalist, by definition, is oriented to *doing*. He is concerned to practice as well as live his profession. Furthermore, as the data have revealed, he is more oriented towards contemporary practitioner roles than traditional ones. It is here, especially, as Samuel Blizzard's research has

---

and the editors--who were much more modern men--came to replace the rabbi. I am indebted to Professor Marvin Bressler of Princeton University for sharing this insight and translations from the Yiddish of some of the letters in Thomas' collection with me.

[48] See Charles Feilding, *Education for Ministry*, *op. cit.*, pp. 27-35, 115-118, and *passim*. This, in fact, is one of the major theses of Fielding's analysis which is based on extensive observation and interviewing of a variety of theological seminaries.

indicated,[49] that there seems to be difficulty. He has adopted more contemporary roles--e.g., pastoral counselor (with a strong clinical psychological orientation), administrator (taking his cue often from business management), community relations specialist (often after the model of the social worker or community organizer), etc. But, as Blizzard's research revealed, quite often these newer roles are not legitimated theologically. The minister is not always sure how these roles are related to or grounded in his theological self-understanding. Nor does he always know what it is that he, qua minister, contributes to these roles that the various secular professionals do not contribute. Nor do his constituents always recognize some of these newer roles as being legitimate ones for the minister.[50] Thus, in his concern to practice as well as to live his profession, and to do so in ways relevant to contemporary experience, he may find himself adopting role models from secular professions without adequate normative legitimation--from his theological tradition and/or his constituents--for the practice of these roles. This, too, is likely to be a partial reason for the morale problem of many instrumentally oriented clergymen.

While these reasons for the morale problem, especially among those with instrumental images of ministry, by no means exhaust the reason for low morale, I suggest that they are important ones, and that they have implications for theological education which need to be given considerable attention by theological educators. Some of these implications will be briefly considered in the concluding chapter of this report.

---

[49] See, especially, "The Minister's Dilemma," loc. cit.

[50] See Glock and Stark, Religion and Society in Tension, op. cit., pp. 144-168.

To recapitulate in detail the rather multi-faceted concerns of this chapter would be too involved. Briefly, however, the importance of image of ministry was considered as providing a basis for a self-concept or identity as well as a frame of reference for organizing one's work and being the image or self-concept one presents to others in role relationships. From this general perspective, the conceptualization and measurement of images of ministry along an expressive-instrumental continuum were considered, and hypotheses were tested regarding the association of models of theological education with differences in image of ministry. In general, it was discovered--as predicted--that the images of ministry varied from more expressive to more instrumental as one moved from the Religious Community to the Vocational School to the Graduate School. The strength of these findings, however, was more seriously called into question by control variables than was true for the previous two major dependent variables considered. More adequate measurement and sampling are suggested as necessary to evaluate these findings.

In addition, two other findings were considered. In the first place, there was general consistency discovered by means of correlations between theological orientation, social-ethical perspectives and image of ministry. A conservative theological orientation is generally associated also with a principles ethical perspective and an expressive image of ministry, while theological liberalism, a contextual ethical perspective and an instrumental image of ministry generally vary together. In the second place, it was found that the more instrumental one's image of ministry, the lower his morale tends to be. Conversely, expressively oriented ministerial images seem considerably less associated with low morale.

Such are, in outline, the primary concerns and findings of this chapter. Also, they conclude the major questions which this research was designed to consider. What remains to be done in the final chapter is to reflect on some of the implications of this study substantively and methodologically, both for future research on professional socialization in general and on theological education in particular. Also, I will attempt to suggest briefly several tentative conclusions regarding the future of theological education which grow out of this analysis.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION: SOME IMPLICATIONS AND SPECULATION

With the rapidity of social change creating new situations which call for continuing socialization through the life-cycle, and with the apparent increase of professional occupations in the overall occupational structure, the need for more adequate understanding of adult socialization, and especially of professional socialization, is apparent. Furthermore, within the profession studied in this research, changes are being called for and attempted to make clergy socialization more relevant to the demands of ministry at this juncture in history. There are vital issues raised in each of these concerns--socialization through the life-cycle, professional socialization, and clergy socialization--that have not begun to be covered in this research report. Yet, it is hoped that, from the more limited scope of this study, some contribution has been made to an understanding of the impact of formally organized agencies of socialization on the more complex total process of professional--and life cycle--socialization. Likewise, it is hoped that some contribution has been made towards a better understanding of the processes of theological education. In this concluding chapter, the purpose is to attempt to draw out some of the implications for professional socialization in general and theological education in particular. In order to do so, it will be helpful first to summarize some of the major findings.

I. MAJOR FINDINGS

No attempt will be made here to summarize all of the findings reported above; however, several of the more important ones bear repetition.

When the respondents were classified according to their ranking of the goals of theological education during seminary, it was possible to compare the four philosophy types on a number of variables. The major purpose was to gain some insight into the correlates of the types and--since the measure of seminary social climate was to be based on the types--to assess the construct validity of the types. It was discovered that differences do exist between the men ascribing to the four philosophies. The Tradition/Spiritual and Practical/Spiritual men, on a number of comparisons, seem to have had a slightly more religiously grounded pre-seminary socialization than the Tradition/Secular or Practical/Secular men. For example, they tended to come from homes where parental participation in religion was high; they described themselves as slightly more committed religiously during high school than the other two groups; and they tended to have decided earlier than the others to enter the ministry. These various findings, I suggested, call to mind Bridston and Culver's critique of the "church boundness" of Protestant seminarians. Conversely, the findings also suggest that the Tradition/Secular and Practical/Secular men are somewhat less "church bound" than the other two groups. These differences between the groups continued in evidence when various aspects of the seminary experience were examined. Types of activities and interests during seminary tended to fall along lines that might be expected for each of the four groups. Likewise, the differences seem to have persisted to some extent when types of ministry anticipated, entered at graduation, and currently engaged in were examined. Both groups giving emphasis to secular awareness--the Tradition/Secular men in particular--were less likely to anticipate, enter, or be currently engaged in parish ministries.

These various comparisons, and others reported above in Chapter Five, indicate that the men differ to some extent individually. Such differences, especially those in the pre-seminary experience, obviously influence the socialization that occurs in theological seminary; nevertheless, it was the major concern of the study to assess the effects of seminary experience on socialization.

The primary variable from the seminary used was that of the social climate or model of theological education. This measure, based on the modal philosophies of the graduates for each of the twenty-one seminaries, also was analyzed for construct validity and for possible important correlates. The three models that emerged empirically--the Religious Community, Vocational School, and the Graduate School--were found to summarize (i.e., to be associated with) a number of variables potentially important for socialization. For example, rates of participation differed in the various types of activities--e.g., corporate worship (highest in the Religious Community), denominational activities (highest in the Vocational School), and participation in social and political action groups (highest in the Graduate School). Faculty supportiveness of the institutional church was reported to be highest in the Religious Community, moderately high in the Vocational School and lowest in the Graduate School. While each of the models was rated relatively high on helpfulness in preparation for the minister's role in the local church, the Graduate School was rated least helpful. On the minister's role in areas beyond the local church, none of the seminaries was rated as especially helpful; however, the Graduate School seminaries were considered to have been more helpful than the others by their graduates. A number of other comparisons were also reported, including an index of institutional quality. On both the composite index, as well as the constituent parts of the index, the Graduate School model was generally higher than the other two types. Also, the Graduate School seminaries were more likely to be university related. These last two comparisons, however, were based on such a small number of cases (21) that inferences can only be drawn with caution.

The net effect of these various seminary comparisons is to suggest that the Religious Community and the Graduate School seminaries exhibit important differences from one another on a number of variables potentially important for socialization, with the Vocational School located in a middle position, somewhat more like the Religious

Community than the Graduate School. Also, it can be inferred that the distinction between secular awareness and spiritual formation accounts for more of the variation between seminaries than does the distinction between mastery of the tradition and practical competence. There were several comparisons, however, in which the latter distinction was manifestly important.

Having compared the individual philosophies and the three types of schools, attention was then turned to the primary question: do the three seminary types explain any of the variation in socialization outcomes when individual philosophies of theological education are held constant? Three dependent variables--theological orientations, social-ethical perspectives, and images of ministry--were analyzed in relation to the seminary types. In general, the hypothesized relationships between seminary types and the three dependent variables were supported. Religious Community graduates were generally more conservative theologically, principles oriented ethically, and expressive in image of ministry. On the other hand, the Graduate School men were the most liberal theologically, contextual ethically, and instrumental in image of ministry. Vocational School graduates tended to fall between the other two types on each of the three dependent variables. Using a structural effects analysis, it was generally found that there was more homogeneity on the dependent variables within each type of school, regardless of individual philosophy of theological education, than there was between those in each type of school with the congruent philosophy of theological education when they were compared with those with similar philosophies in other schools.

In order to test for possible spuriousness of the relationships described in the preceding paragraph, a number of other variables were introduced into the analysis. In the majority of cases, the variables did not reduce the original relationship; rather, in many cases, they helped to interpret the relation and to give further insight into the socialization process. In several cases, however, the original relationships did not appear to hold when the control variables were introduced. Whether these deviant cases indicate actual spuriousness or are the result of measurement problems or small samples is not clear without additional research.

In addition to the major dependent variables, several other variables--representing other attitude measures available from the large amount of data from the Danforth Study--were examined. In brief, the more theologically conservative men, as might be expected, had less uncertainty over basic issues of faith, while the men who were more liberal theologically also tended to be more uncertain. Those who were principles oriented on social issues also tended to adopt relatively more conservative positions on several current social issues, while contextually oriented men were relatively more liberal. A further set of comparisons indicated that enjoyment of the more traditional practitioner roles of the minister was positively correlated with an expressive image of ministry and the more contemporary roles with an instrumental image.

In general, then, theological conservatism, a principles ethical orientation, and an expressive image of ministry suggest a more traditional ministerial stance, while theological liberalism, a contextual ethical perspective, and an instrumental image of ministry seem to be more contemporary in orientation. These measures, in fact, were found to cluster together to some extent when scale correlations were computed. Paradoxically, perhaps, the respondents who were more contemporary in orientation and, therefore, one might surmise, more "in tune" with modern society, were those who tended to have the greatest problem of professional morale. The more traditionally focussed ministers, on the other hand, were least likely to face morale problems. This finding, in particular, has important implications for theological education which will be further considered below.

With this brief summary of the findings, the discussion turns now to a consideration of a few of the theoretical and methodological implications of the study, and especially to several of the practical implications for theological education.

II. METHODOLOGICAL AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

There was no intention in this study to demonstrate a sociologistic reductionism by concentrating primarily on sociological dimensions of socialization. While a psychologist may complain of the neglect of psychological variables, and some theologians may feel uneasy at the empirical level on which the analysis has moved, such reductionism was methodological; and, I believe it has been justified, considering the results. Obviously any complete analysis of socialization must consider factors in addition to sociological variables; however, the findings of the study clearly indicate that any concern with the total socialization process will be truncated and inadequate unless the impact of social structures is considered as an important factor in the process.

That such an abstract concept as organizational goals or mission can be conceptualized, measured, and analyzed fruitfully as a variable in socialization studies seems to be one of the more important theoretical and methodological implications of the findings. To be sure, much is lacking due to the relatively crude level of measurement utilized above. I have already commented on some of these problems in Chapter Four. Also, I have made suggestions as to possible refinements. Nevertheless the basic point--that organizational goals are preferences which individuals within an organization have for the organization, and which become externalized and institutionalized as the common values or "social climate" of the organization--provides, I suggest, important insights into the impact of socializing, as well as other types of organizations, on individuals. Further study needs to be done, however, to measure the importance of varying degrees of "strength" of social climates for socialization. This, in turn, suggests what the limited analysis of peer groups indicated: that peer groups are important mechanisms either for the reinforcing of the impact of the dominant social climate or for subverting this impact.

To return to the issue of goals and social climates, it seems likely that the theory and methodology used in this study have potential uses for studies of other professional schools (and other agencies of socialization). Historical and descriptive analyses of education in other professions reveal somewhat similar development of models or types of schools which are more or less reflected in their contemporary progeny.[1] But whether there are historic models or not, it seems likely that socialization agencies in other professions may be compared as to the priorities given to socialization goals and fruitfully differentiated by means of such analysis. Hopefully, however, further refinements in the analysis of goals may be developed.[2]

---

[1] While there is no one-to-one correspondence with the three historic types of theological schools discussed in this study, Flexner's account of the history of medical education (Abraham Flexner, Medical Education, A Comparative Study (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), especially Chapter Two); Lovell's comparative analysis of the three United States service academies,("From Seminary to University: Organizational Change in the Nation's Service Academies"); and Warkov's distinction between types of law schools, (Seymour Warkov, with Joseph Zelan, Lawyers in the Making) are each suggestive of the possibilities for analyses similar to this one in medical, military and legal professional socialization. See also the articles from professional educators from a variety of professions in Theological Education, V (Spring, 1969).

[2] See the recent work by Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review, XXXIII (August, 1968), pp. 518-544. Gross measures a considerably

A more ambitious undertaking might involve the use of a similar theory and method in a comparative analysis across professional lines. If this were done, then the conceptualization of goals, of models (social climates) of professional education, and of socialization outcomes would need to be carried to a higher level of generality. Are there, for example, analogues in other professions to the four goals defined in this study? Clearly the two defined as mastery of the tradition and practical competence can be generalized to other professions; and the same seems to be true in comparing what I have called the goal of secular awareness with the concern that the profession be related to important social issues (for example, problems in the cities). This concern is found in some medical schools, law schools, and business schools.[3] The goal of spiritual formation has its closest analogues in the concerns for shaping professional values according to professional ethics and for fostering a sense of

---

larger number of goal dimensions of universities than socialization goals. It is clear that, for a full analysis of educational institutions as organizations, such completeness is important; however, a more limited focus is possibly warranted in an analysis of socialization. Nevertheless, Gross' study reminds one that educational institutions have a considerable number of goals, of which socialization is only one. The other goals may often be in conflict with socialization goals.

[3] See, for example, the articles by Kenneth Andrews, "The Progress of Professional Education for Business," and Donald Cavers, "Legal Education in a Time of Change," in Theological Education, V (Spring, 1969), pp. 144-166, 170-196.

professional solidarity.[4]

Although a lengthy discussion of a more general theoretical interpretation to be given to these four goals of professional education is inappropriate at this point, it is interesting to speculate briefly concerning possible linkages with more general theory. I would suggest that one fruitful line of inquiry might be to consider these goals as derivable from Talcott Parsons' four-fold table of functional imperatives of any system of action: pattern-maintenance, integration, goal-attainment and adaptation.[5] While there is not one-to-one correspondence of the four concrete goals in this study with Parsons' analytic classification, it nevertheless seems that each of the four goals can be thought of as being primarily related to a particular functional imperative. Here, the functional imperatives have reference to the profession as the system of action; that is, the needs of the profession determine the primary goals of agencies of professional socialization. Thus, the imperative of pattern maintenance is primarily fulfilled in the goal of mastery of the tradition and its analogues in other professions. Integration is primarily fulfilled in what I have called spiritual formation and its analogues, especially in the promotion of professional solidarity. There is some correspondence between goal-attainment and practical competence, and also between adaptation and secular awareness. Obviously, there is some arbitrariness to this classification, and considerable reflection needs to be done to clarify some of the relationships; however, I suggest it as one potentially fruitful way to interpret goals of professional socialization in a manner generalizable across professions, as well as a possible linkage with other aspects of general theory.[6]

---

[4] See W. J. Goode, "Community Within a Community: The Professions," American Sociological Review, XX (1957), pp. 194-200. While the explicitly religious dimensions of spiritual formation are probably lacking in other professions, there are clearly implicit or quasi-religious dimensions in the socialization practices in other professions. The "Sound and Light" program, an annual event at West Point at the time of entry into the Corps of each new plebe class, is one of the clearest examples of a secular analogue to attempts at spiritual formation that the author has witnessed. Wilbert E. Moore's suggestion of a "punishment-centered theory of socialization" (see Moore and Rosenblum, The Professions in Modern Society, op. cit., p. IV/19), in which solidarity and commitment to the profession and professional values are encouraged by challenging and painful shared experiences, provides a further insight into analogues of spiritual formation.

[5] Talcott Parsons, "An Outline of the Social System," Theories

A simpler way of conceptualizing the four goals at a more general level--also in the Parsonian tradition--is to see them as reflecting the four types of action which Parsons and Shils discuss

---

of Society, eds. Parsons, et al. (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), I, pp. 38-41.

[6] In her interesting study of Catholic priests, Sister Marie Augusta Neal developed a similar line of reasoning to a greater degree than has been done so here. She likewise suggested Parsons' fourfold classification as a possible model for analysis of professions. See Values and Interests in Social Change, op. cit., pp. 11-17. See also Hoyt A. Oliver, "Professional Authority and the Professional Ministry: A Study of an Occupational Image" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1966).

in an earlier work: (1) intellectual (corresponding to mastery of tradition); (2) expressive (corresponding to spiritual formation); (3) evaluative (corresponding to secular awareness); and (4) instrumental (corresponding to practical competence).[7] Space does not permit carrying this speculation further; however, for cross-professional comparisons, such general classification schemes might prove quite useful. Furthermore, as suggested above, this link with general theory has potential for increasing understanding of professions and professional socialization.

I have concentrated in this section on the implications of this study with reference to goals of agencies of professional socialization and their significance as they become embodied in the social climate of the schools. As is obvious, I have been especially interested in the generalizability of the theory and method of analysis to other professions and to cross-professional comparative analyses, which very much need to be undertaken. Rather than extend this section further by considering other possible implications--e.g., a similar possible generalizability of the dimensions of what has been called the "professional self" or "point of view"[8]--I wish to turn now more specifically to some implications of the findings for theological education.

---

[7] Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds.), Toward a General Theory of Action (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 75. A minor disadvantage of this more simple (and perhaps more useful) classification in the duplication of the terms expressive and instrumental, which were used elsewhere in this study in a different connection.

[8] A cross-professional comparison which considers variables

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

There are a number of directions in which one might go in considering the implications of these findings for theological education. Many of these implications have been mentioned at various places in the preceding chapters. Rather than reviewing these or raising a variety of additional points for consideration, it seems more appropriate to concentrate on what has been a central feature of this study: the concern with models of theological education. First, how adequate for the present and future are the models which have been considered? And, second, are there clues in the study for developing a more adequate model?

The models which were derived empirically from the data in this study are not, as I have taken pains to emphasize, direct correlates of the historic models of theological education described in Chapter Three. Nevertheless, I have found it heuristically useful and, I believe, fruitful to consider the empirical types as bearing more than a passing resemblance to the historic models. My critique of the three models continues this assumption of some structural correspondence.

---

similar in part to what I have called the professional's point of view is the previously mentioned study by Becker and Carper, "The Elements of Identification with a Profession," *loc. cit.*

As a framework for evaluating these models and for considering possible implications of the study for a new model, I suggest that professional education, if it is to be effective in its socializing task, must keep in dynamic relation at least three foci. One focus has to do with the internal imperatives which arise from within the profession itself, especially from the body of knowledge which the profession "professes" and the code of ethics governing its use. A second focus must be the broader society which is the context for professional practice. Obviously, the kind of society--its dominant values, its state of development, and its needs--has a profound influence on professional practice and, therefore, on the kind of professional socialization required. The third focus is the profession's clients, who, quite often represent a more restricted segment of the larger society and are the primary role partners in the role system of the profession. For the professional minister, these three foci are, generally speaking, the Judaeo-Christian tradition, contemporary society, and the members of the minister's congregation (as a partial analogue to the clients of other professions).

If those concerned with the socialization of professionals fail to maintain the relation (often tension) between the three foci, then the socialization is likely to be truncated and inadequate. To neglect the first is to risk allowing expediency to overrule the imperatives growing out of the profession's body of knowledge and code of ethics. But to neglect either or both of the latter two is to neglect the imperatives growing out of the structural context of professional practice. Whether professional educators evaluate these latter imperatives positively or negatively, they cannot ignore them and do an effective job of socialization.

In reflecting on the findings of this study regarding the three models of theological education, it is my judgment--admittedly reflecting my own values--that none of the three adequately maintains the necessary relationship between the foci mentioned above. None really constitutes an adequate model for theological education in the present or immediate future.

The Religious Community, socializing its graduates into generally traditional and conservative orientations to theology, ethics and ministry, is insufficiently open to the dynamics of modern society to prepare men for a relevant and effective ministry. While an effective ministry is not always one most consonant with contemporary society, and while consonance with society has never been idealized within the Judaeo-Christian tradition, there is little virtue in perpetuating a professional point of view which is no longer tenable within our scientifically oriented, rapidly changing world. It is unlikely that a theology reflecting a pre-scientific world view, an ethical orientation growing out of a more stable, slower changing social experience, or more traditional, expressive images of ministry are viable vehicles through which the church can be enabled to carry on its ministry of reconciliation in modern society. It is probably true that men with this more conservative and traditional point of view tend to have higher morale than other ministers in the study, but I suspect--and here I clearly make a value judgment--that high morale as a correlate of such traditional and conservative orientations is possible in our society mainly within the context of a type of religious ghetto. By this I mean a context in which primary attention is given to spiritual or otherworldly concerns, or to the maintenance of the internal life of the congregation, rather than to the church's mission in society, to matters of social justice and reconciliation. Apart from the fact that practical considerations make ghettos difficult to maintain,[9] the reconciling mission of the church makes the perpetuation of religious ghettos indefensible. To the extent that the Religious Community model contributes to this "ghettoization" of the church and ministry, no matter how high the morale of these ministers,[10] then it is not, in my judgment, viable as a model of theological education today.

If the Religious Community model is inadequate, so also is the

---

[9] See Peter Berger, "The Secularization of Theology," pp. 12-13, for an interesting discussion of this problem with reference to theology.

[10] One possible interpretation of the positive correlation of high morale with the more conservative or traditional point of view may be that the general conservatism of these men (and, perhaps, of their congregations) enables them to avoid involvement in complex and trying social issues which may challenge their effectiveness in dealing with such issues. That is, one maximizes high morale by minimizing his risk-taking.

Graduate School which clearly represents tendencies in the opposite direction. To generalize, it is in these schools that theological studies have been most academic and research oriented, that criticism of the church (including disdain for the "practical" fields) has been strongest, and that openness to society has been greatest. While I do not wish to minimize the importance of academic research in various theological disciplines, if this is the primary approach taken in preparing men for professional ministry, it is inadequate. It tends to perpetuate a bifurcation of thought and practice so that the academic theology of the classroom and the life situations which the student faces in practice are rarely brought into juxtaposition. He finds himself unable to draw on the one to aid in the interpretation of the other.[11] Likewise, the criticism of the church as a social institution, especially the parish church, leaves men considerably uncertain about the viability of the primary social context in and through which currently they have to practice their profession. Furthermore, the general disdain for the "practical" fields often leaves men basically unprepared to practice their profession. And, finally, openness to society, while essential in light of the church's ministry of reconciliation, can be extremely debilitating of professional morale. Not only is this the area of ministry in which conflict and controversy are most likely to arise with many of the minister's constituents, but there is also the frustration of being aware of and concerned with issues with which one is unprepared professionally to cope. It will be recalled that ministers who were alumni of Graduate School seminaries were most likely to complain of the inadequacies of preparation for socially-oriented ministries. It is one thing for the seminary to encourage openness to society; it is quite another thing to prepare men to cope adequately as professional ministers with the situations faced in a complex society. Thus, for several reasons, the Graduate School model, like the Religious Community model, is an inadequate model of theological education

---

[11] Charles Feilding, Education For Ministry, op. cit., pp. 29-35, gives a hypothetical case study of this bifurcation of thought and practice and suggests that, while the student may develop his own "practical theology" to interpret the situations he faces, it is often second rate and naive.

The Vocational School model is, in many respects, a via media between the two extremes; however, given the inadequacies of the extremes, it is no real virtue to stand between them. In general, it will be recalled, the Vocational School leans more in the direction of the Religious Community as far as lack of openness to society is concerned. It shares, I believe, in similar tendencies toward the maintenance of a religious ghetto. However, it does so with less emphasis upon mastery of the tradition than upon competence in the practice of ministry within the church. And this, as I indicated earlier, creates a greater likelihood that expediency rather than the integrity of the tradition governs practice.[12] Furthermore, the emphasis on practical competence, divorced to some extent also from an openness to contemporary society, creates the likelihood of greater competence in traditional ministerial roles than in roles which are more contemporary (and sometimes more relevant to the situation of modern society). To the extent that this is the case (and the findings suggest that it is), then practical competence, as a primary goal emphasis of the Vocational School, does not always insure the socialization of ministers who are, in fact, practically competent to respond creatively to the new situations facing the church and ministry.

In short, I do not believe that any one of the three traditional models of theological education is adequate for equipping contemporary professional ministries. What, therefore, might a more adequate model be like?

An effective model of theological education, I have suggested, would give attention to the dynamic interrelationships between the historic Judaeo-Christian tradition, the church, and contemporary society. How are the three best related? What is implied by them for ministry (and, therefore, for theological education)? To attempt a full answer to these questions is beyond the scope of this study; nevertheless, without attempting to justify or support my contention, I suggest that perhaps the central integrating focus around which professional ministries will be organized in the future will be that of interpreter or definer of situations.

---

[12] It will be recalled that in the findings regarding attitudes on racial justice, Vocational School graduates tended to be slightly more conservative than Religious Community graduates. I suggested then that the difference may be partially due to the relatively greater emphasis in the Religious Community on mastery of the Christian tradition with its norms of justice and love.

Rapid social change and the breakdown of traditional legitimating systems have created for many persons a crisis of meaning.[13] Whatever else the professional role of the minister may involve, such as skill in counseling, administration, community organization, etc., I suggest that the unique contribution which he has to make as a professional will be as enabler in the search for meaning. This, of course, is nothing new; however, as I pointed out in the preceding chapter, ministers have often not been content with this role, probably because they have not been very adept at it. Either they were inadequately prepared to understand the situation in society, or, understanding society, they were unable to relate the Christian tradition to it in a meaningful way.[14] I do not mean to suggest that ministers have a "corner on the market" of meaning definition, nor are they able to define situations with unquestionable authority. Nevertheless, if there is any continuing viability to the historic Christian symbols, then enabling persons in their decision making and in their search for meaning to appropriate that viability for themselves is a central contribution which the minister has to make. Further, the ability to draw on the historic tradition in joining with others in criticizing present social structures and values and projecting new ones is a central dimension of this meaning-defining role.

---

[13] For a recent and, to my mind, important discussion of the crisis of meaning and of the various attempts to rediscover meaningful symbols, see Orrin E. Klapp, Collective Search for Identity (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969). Klapp's thesis is "that a collective identity search is symptomatic of the fact that some modern social systems deprive people of psychological 'payoffs,' the lack of which, expressed by terms such as alienation, meaninglessness, identity problem, motivates a mass groping for activities and symbols with which to restore or find new identity." (vii). Further, he says that "The urgent question of the twentieth century, in its looming age of leisure, is not What can I do? but Who can I be?" (x).

Without developing this further, I suggest that this understanding of ministry might well inform a model or models of theological education for the years ahead. What, more specifically, might such a model look like in terms of its basic ordering of goals?

I would suggest, to begin with, that, however concretely defined, the general goals of theological education can still be thought of in terms of the basic four-fold pattern used in this study.

---

[14] In a recent article, Richard Shaull has written: "We engage in constant exploration and discussion of the great themes and moments in our theological tradition; we attempt to relate all this to the contemporary situation. But for some reason, even our best efforts in this regard seem to leave us stranded in a world unlike that of our secular contemporaries. And most of our students, conservative or liberal, are simply lost. At one moment they mouth empty clichés picked up along the way; at the next, they confess that they have no idea what it means to think theologically about life today." "The Challenge to the Seminary," Christianity and Crisis, XXIX (April 14, 1969), p. 81.

In Chapter Three, I suggested that the general goals have been variously defined in the different models; for example, there have been both Catholic and Protestant pietist versions of spiritual formation as well as different connotations of mastery of the tradition. While this redefinition must continue to take place, it seems likely that there will be no diminishing of the need for an encounter with the Judaeo-Christian tradition, for the development of the requisite theory and skills for the practice of ministry, for the formation of ministers in Christian community, and for an openness toward and engagement with the dynamics of society.

Although I am suggesting that the goals, however redefined in their specific connotations, will continue to be components of the overall mission of theological education, it seems very likely that the model of theological education necessary to meet the demands of the kind of ministry I have described will place the goal emphases in a different rank order from previous models. What might this rank ordering of goal emphases be? Earlier, I raised the question whether the one type of goal combination that did not emerge empirically in the study might not contain clues for the future? That is, does a combination of dominant emphasis on practical competence and secular awareness constitute a viable model of theological education for the kind of ministry needed today? Such a model would, as I hope to make clear below, in no way constitute a sacrifice of basic theological integrity (that is, a bringing about a de-emphasis on the Christian tradition) or of a concern for committed ministers (that is, spiritual formation). Rather, what I am proposing is a model in which, to a degree not attained in previous models, the demands of the practice of a professionally competent ministry in a challenging, complex and rapidly changing society are the central focus around which the whole is organized.

Those familiar with developments in theological education over the past four or five years will recognize that attempts are being made in a number of schools to restructure theological education along lines not at all unlike what is being proposed here.[15] In addition, there is the rather detailed and impressive "Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," proposed by the Resources Planning Commission of the American Association of Theological Schools.[16] This proposal, which goes into considerable detail concerning organizational structure, also reflects a basically similar orientation to the one proposed here. Rather than review or critique these various programs and proposals,

---

[15] A full list of these programs would be too involved; however, for descriptions and discussions of a few of them, see the Chicago Theological Seminary Register, LX (November, 1965); Donald Shriver, "Standing Between the Structures," The Duke Divinity School Review, XXXIII (Autumn, 1968), pp. 182-195; "Relevant Ministry Through Radical Involvement," St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City, Missouri (printed brochure, no date); George W. Webber, "Vision for a Seminary," New York Theological Seminary (unpublished mimeographed paper, April 21, 1969); Garrett Theological Seminary Newsletter, October, 1969; and The Emory Magazine, XLV (May-June, 1969), pp. 38-39.

[16] "Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," Theological Education, IV (Spring, 1968), pp. 671-726.

I believe that it will be useful to suggest how the goals (ordered as I suggested above) might be defined,[17] while the concrete structural expressions of this model will likely take a plurality of forms.[18]

First of all, this model would be in rather direct contradiction to the classic Religious Community model, with its sheltered "seed bed" (seminarium) conception of theological education. Just as strongly as the classical Religious Community fostered ideological commitment to an otherworldly expression of Christian faith, so would this new model foster commitment to a this-worldly expression. That is, the secular world, as has been suggested, would be taken with utmost seriousness as the central context for the education of ministers. Not simply the location of the seminary, but, more importantly, the definition of the situation by the faculty and administration, would function to enhance and encourage the openness to and involvement in the dynamics of society.

What does contemporary society look like? Which aspects of society hinder and which foster the realization of a more fully human existence? What areas are those in which the need for reconciliation is greatest? What are the non-ecclesiastical agencies in society which are also working for reconciliation and humanization? What is the distinctive contribution which the church and its ministries, parish or otherwise, might make in society? What is the meaning and significance of the historic Christian tradition for modern men, and how does the current human situation inform and aid the interpretation of the tradition? These are some of the general kinds of questions that the this-worldly emphasis implies.

---

[17] It is important to emphasize that the four goals are separated here for analytical purposes. Empirically, they are related in a dynamic, interactive mix.

[18] Here I am in general agreement with some of the critics of the "Theological Curriculum for the 1970's" that it is too monolithic in the concrete structures proposed. See "A Plea For Multiple Strategies in Theological Education," Theological Education, V (Winter, 1969), pp. 112-118.

Practically, such an emphasis would suggest that, during their seminary years, students would be involved in a variety of carefully planned and supervised experiences in secular society, in addition to creative church ministries. These experiences might be in a hospital, a prison, a factory, a university, a community organization, a congressman's staff, city hall, etc. Whether limited or long term, such experiences would have several functions. For one thing, they would provide the context for developing both analytical skills and a sympathetic understanding of the situations which others face in various sectors of society. The student hopefully would become deeply sensitive to differences in the physical, personal, and cultural impact of social structures on individuals and groups and the implications of this for the realization of a person's full humanity. Secondly, such experiences would function importantly as _agents provocateur_ for the student's reflection in the classroom. The kind of bifurcation of academic theology and existential questions described above cannot long continue where conscious efforts are made to foster dialogue between the experiences students have in their various involvements in society and the thought and experience of the historical community of faith. If faculty do not overcome this bifurcation willingly, there is little doubt that socially aware students will see to it that the faculty begin to "get with the action." In the third place, such experiences would expose students to other helping agencies and professions and encourage mutual enrichment and cooperation across professional lines in trying to find out how best to work together in commonly shared areas. The complexity of society and of personal and social problems makes older conceptions of the omnicompetent, solo practitioner something of an anachronism. What is occurring in team approaches within medicine and within ministry, for example, must also occur across professional lines, and the encouragement needs to begin in the professional schools.[19] Finally, and obviously, these experiences in society, especially in the latter part of the student's seminary career would provide the context for intensive supervised experience in various specialized ministries in non-ecclesiastical structures. Such ministries are likely to increase in the future whether they are church supported or perhaps follow the pattern of the worker-priest movement.

---

[19] A pilot program along these lines will occur in Atlanta in the summer of 1970, when a selected number of students from several professional schools in the metropolitan area will be involved in an intensive work/study seminar in the Atlanta Model Cities area. Law, medicine, nursing, theology and business school students and faculty will participate. See also, Kenneth Underwood, The Church, The University and Social Policy (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1969), Vol. I, pp. 446-449.

If the focus on contemporary society as the context for theological education constitutes a primary characteristic of the model I am proposing, a second characteristic is an explicit awareness that preparation of professionally competent and informed persons for Christian ministries in contemporary society is the raison d'etre of theological education. The plural "ministries" is emphasized, since, as I suggested above, it seems likely that specialized ministries will increase in the coming decades. What I am suggesting by stressing preparation for professional ministries is not a reversion to a vulgar trade school approach which gives primacy to the pragmatic criterion: will it work (or preach)? Nor am I suggesting that what is taught in theological schools be solely determined by the exigencies of the present practice of ministry.[20] What I am suggesting, however, is that developing competence in practice of ministry be a focal and central concern in the entire process of theological education, which, after all, seems to be a basic criterion distinguishing professional from general education. More explicitly, this implies an overcoming of the previously mentioned disjunction between academic theology and existential experiences which leaves men frustrated at their often naive and inadequate attempts to interpret theologically new and complex situations that arise in a rapidly changing society. Likewise, such a focal concern with preparation of persons for ministries implies the necessity for overcoming the long-standing bifurcation (and frequent neglect of one or the other) of theory and practice. Such bifurcation, as has been suggested, leaves men without adequate theoretical undergirding (especially theological legitimation) for their various practitioner roles, particularly the newer, non-traditional ones.

---

[20] See Gustafson, "Theological Education as Professional Education," Theological Education, op. cit., pp. 246-249, for a discussion of this problem.

What this may mean in practical terms in theological schools is likely to be quite varied. A hopeful trend is the refurbishing of field education and the redefinition of it as supervised ministry.[21] More sophisticated programs of supervised ministry, in which students are involved in supervised (and interpreted) experiences in creative church ministries as well as the previously mentioned experiences in various areas of secular society, can help considerably to overcome the disjunction between theology and experience and theory and practice. In addition, I suspect that also implied practically are: the use of teaching methods which encourage the development of analytic, interpretative and integrative skills rather than rote learning; team teaching by discipline- and ministry-oriented faculty members; the joining of these two groups of faculty with field supervisors in the task of supervising the field experiences (ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical) of students; the development of better theory by the ministry-oriented faculty, and more attention to professional and existential concerns by the discipline-oriented faculty.[22] Whatever the specific method used, I suggest that a viable model of theological education must have the preparation of professionally competent and informed persons for Christian ministries as a basic concern.

---

[21] See Feilding, Education For Ministry, op. cit., pp. 176-252.

These two foci--professional ministries in contemporary society--by no means imply that any less attention should be given to mastery of the historical tradition of the Christian community. President Kingman Brewster of Yale has recently challenged theological schools with the crucial nature of the theological task as follows:

> We are all searching out the roots and structures of faith and purpose in the modern world. It may be that the Divinity School has nothing to say in this search, but this also would be worth finding out . . . . Hopefully the church will not try to be an amateur in everything but will develop a professional competence with one discipline, theology, the organizing principle of its thought. There has never been a time for greater and more exciting opportunities to engage in discussion of the kinds of issues I have described.[23]

---

[22] I would not wish to give the impression that teaching methods and curriculum matters are all that is necessary to attend to if education for professional ministries is to be a central focus. For example, one should not overlook possible implications of such matters as the kinds of criteria used for granting tenure and promotions to faculty. Should the criteria for professional schools be identical to those used in university departments? Do the latter at times tend to be subversive of the best interests of professional education?

[23] From a speech at Yale Divinity School, May 11, 1966; cited

The proposal for theological education being suggested here is not basically contradictory to what President Brewster has proposed. His plea for professional competence in theology is set in the context of the search for faith and purpose in the modern world. Likewise, there is no suggestion here that secondary status be given to theology; rather, the plea is that the knowledge of the Christian tradition neither be divorced from the contemporary search for meaning nor from developing the competence to carry on the dialogue between tradition and experience in a significant way.

At the risk of repetition, I cannot express too strongly my conviction that the most glaring failure of theological education has been at the point of the integration of biblical, historical and theological categories and insights from the tradition of the church with the realities of present personal and social existence.[24] Yet, if I am at all correct about the minister's role in the future as a definer of meaning and as a participant in the search for new values and institutions, then any viable model of theological education must overcome this disjunction. I suspect that the crisis of morale

---

in Underwood, The Church, The University and Social Policy, op. cit., p. 435.

[24] In a class assignment, I have asked students to develop a doctrine of sin using such works as Michael Harrington's The Other America as the data for their analysis. It has been frequently discouraging to discover the inability of most students to break out of their narrowly individualistic orientation to recognize any kinship between institutionalized socio-cultural dehumanization and a theological interpretation of sin.

explored in preceding chapters might be considerably alleviated if seminary graduates were to find themselves more competent in bridging the gap between the historic tradition and present socio-cultural realities.

To bridge this gap in no way minimizes the necessity for theological research and scholarship on the part of faculties. But it does mean, I suspect, focusing not only on the tradition itself, but also helping students to understand the context in which the various aspects of the tradition were "hammered out." In such a way they begin to appreciate the tradition as a living one, addressed, when it has been most vital, to the existential questions men were facing at various periods of history and which may or may not be similar to the questions of today. In addition to dealing with the content and context of the tradition, students need to develop their own theological methodology, that is, the ability themselves to undertake the interpretative task in light of the present historical context. In such ways mastery of the tradition is not minimized or compromised, but constituted as the central tool for the practice of ministry in contemporary society.

The final point I would make concerning this proposed model concerns the possible significance of spiritual formation. What role, if any, should such a traditional emphasis play in a theological school committed to engagement in secular society? It has not gone unnoticed that the ministers in the study who suffered least from a crisis of morale were those with expressive images of ministry. Furthermore, expressive images of ministry were associated with seminaries which gave a priority to spiritual formation in its more traditional meaning. But, as the data also revealed, these seminaries are characterized generally by a theological and ethical conservatism that are, in my judgment, basically inadequate and anachronistic. Therefore, I do not propose that the more traditional understanding of spiritual formation, whether along catholic or evangelical lines, is adequate for the new model under consideration. Nevertheless, I am convinced that any viable model of theological education must discover a functional equivalent to the more traditional conceptions of spiritual formation. The definitions and expressions of spirituality or sanctity may be somewhat different from earlier generations, but for reasons of professional identity, for morale, and for effectiveness in ministry, such a functional equivalent is necessary.[25] Most recent discussions of spiritual formation attempt to redefine or broaden it to include the fostering and deepening of Christian commitment,[26] of personal maturity and interpersonal competence, of growth towards what is called in the New Testament "mature manhood."[27] I am in fundamental agreement with this kind of broadened interpretation of spiritual formation; however, in light of the emphasis being made on the minister as interpreter and definer of meaning and values, I want to mention briefly a possible further dimension of spiritual formation which, I believe, must be cultivated along with the above attributes.

---

[25] See the discussion of charisma and its continued importance in Demerath and Hammond, Religion in Social Context, op. cit., pp. 59-69. Interestingly, the article, "The New Ministry: Bringing God Back to Life," Time, XCIV (December 26, 1969), p. 44, gives considerable attention to the dimension of spirituality as an increasingly important aspect of activist ministries.

[26] The use of "fostering" is deliberate, since there have been in recent years an increasing number of persons enrolling in

Interpretation, meaning-giving, relating the experiences of the historic community to contemporary experience, involve the capacity to penetrate beneath the surface of circumstances and events in order to "interpret the signs of the times."[28] Theodore Roszak, in his highly provocative analysis of youth culture,[29] draws on the classic figure of the shaman as a prime example of one who manifests this capacity of "interpreting the signs," of seeing beneath the surface, and of communicating his vision to others not so gifted. I am certain that Roszak would object to drawing parallels between the more spontaneous, charismatic role of the shaman and the role of the professional

---

seminaries who are quite uncertain of their basic commitment. Such students frequently are among the better students academically.

[27] Ephesians 4:13.

[28] See Matthew 16:3.

[29] The Making of a Counter Culture (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969), especially pp. 239-268.

minister;[30] nevertheless, I find it quite instructive to do so in limited fashion regarding spiritual formation. In describing the shaman, Roszak says that

> The respect felt for him is the respect many of us feel for the especially gifted person, the artist or performer whose uncanny influence over us does not lie in any office he holds but in his manifest skill.
>
> In order to heighten that skill, the shaman devotes himself to a life of severe discipline and solitude. He fasts, he prays, he meditates; he isolates himself in order that he may watch out for such signs as the presences make visible for his education. Above all, he becomes adept at cultivating those exotic states of awareness in which a submerged aspect of his personality seems to free itself from his surface consciousness to rove among the hidden powers of the universe. . . .
>
> By such techniques, the shaman cultivates his rapport with the non-intellective sources of his personality as assiduously as any scientist trains himself to objectivity. . . .[31]

I hardly mean to suggest this description of the shaman's discipline as a literal model for the spiritual formation of ministers. However, I do suggest that spiritual formation involves the "exploding" of one's imagination, developing the capacity to wonder, to experience awe, and to "interpret the signs of the times." The description of the shaman's discipline suggests the importance of developing similarly appropriate disciplines for the theological school, including creative and imaginative corporate worship, the use of the arts, and a variety of other kinds of experiences which, while not anti-intellectual, involve more than the intellect.

---

[30] See, for example, _Ibid_., p. 246.

[31] _Ibid_., p. 247.

While I have omitted many important concerns and treated others somewhat superficially, I would suggest this as the possible "thrust" or philosophy of a model of education appropriate for the present and emerging future. I have not given a designation, as yet, to this proposed model; however, it does not seem inappropriate simply to refer to it as the Professional School model. To be sure, I have also treated the other models as professional schools, that is, as schools engaged in professional socialization. However, I have tried to make clear where I believe these models seem to be inadequate for the socialization of professional ministers able to function effectively in contemporary society. The new model, the outlines of which I have sketched above, is suggested as one which has significant and relevant professional ministry as its basic aims. Thus, it may not be inappropriate, if labels are useful, to call it the Professional School model. The concrete structure which such a model might take has not been considered, since, as I indicated above, I suspect that it allows for a plurality of specific forms which, furthermore, I believe are necessary. The concrete manifestations of the model would depend in part on the location of the seminary, on its size and resources, and on the ecclesiastical tradition, if any, of the seminary (assuming that most seminaries will maintain denominational ties even if they are ecumenical in orientation). Nevertheless, the preparation of effective and informed professionals for ministry in a complex and challenging society would provide the focus around which the whole is organized.

In proposing this Professional School model, and in mentioning other models, a very important question has gone begging. It is one thing to propose new models of education, theological or otherwise; it is quite another matter to effect change so that the new model might replace an old one. The data of this study--see especially Table 2 above--reveal that social climates (as expressions of models) do change, but they change rather slowly. The data do not reveal whether the changes were planned or not, and, if planned, what or who were the agents of change. These are questions of considerable importance; however, any adequate answer can be given only after considerable further research.[32] Suffice it to say that the kind of change required to institutionalize a new model of theological education such as the one proposed here is more than a matter of changing the curriculum, which often seems to be the primary concern of faculties and administrators. While curriculum matters are obviously important, there are other variables such as student recruitment policies, student peer groups (which are closely related to the types of students recruited), teaching methods, promotion and tenure policies, and the criteria for evaluating student performances, not to mention other such matters as adequate finances for making the necessary changes, physical facilities and the general social ecology of the school. Also, there is the matter of the example of other seminaries (especially the prestigious ones, or the ones in which most of the faculty of a given seminary were trained). If those seminaries lead the way in innovation, then it is easier for others to follow.[33] These are matters, however, as I suggested, on which considerable research is necessary.

---

[32] Donald R. Ploch of Yale University is currently engaged in research attempting to answer some of these questions. For an initial statement of some of the possible variables involved, see his unpublished paper, "Socialization and Social Change: A Study of the Causes of Change in the Socialization Process" (1965).

It is obvious that there is much yet to be learned about professional socialization in general and about theological education as a particular kind of professional socialization. This study has examined only one aspect, albeit an important one, of the process. Hopefully, it has made clear some of the ways in which differences in organizational structure affect the outcomes of socialization. Hopefully, too, other research will build on this, refine our understanding of the important variables in the process, and aid in effecting planned change and improvement. After all, to revert to the initial quotation from Robert Burns, it is a matter of no mean importance for the church (and possibly for society) what kind of animals our seminaries are producing!

---

[33] However, as I have suggested previously, it may be that the less prestigious and newer seminaries are the real innovators today, since they have less tradition on which to stand.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS AND ESSAYS

Barton, Allen H. *Organizational Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

Becker, Howard S., *et al*. *Boys in White, Student Culture in Medical School*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Berger, Peter L. *Invitation to Sociology: A Humanistic Perspective*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1963.

________, *The Noise of Solemn Assemblies*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961.

________, *The Precarious Vision*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961.

________, *The Sacred Canopy*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1967.

________, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1967.

Blau, Peter. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Blauner, Robert. *Alienation and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Ethics*. Trans. N. H. Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955.

Bouyer, Fr. Louis. *Introduction to Spirituality*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1961.

Bridston, Keith R. and Dwight W. Culver (eds.). *The Making of Ministers, Essays on Clergy Training Today*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964.

Bridston, Keith R. and Dwight W. Culver. *Pre-Seminary Education*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1965.

Brim, Orville G., Jr., and Stanton Wheeler. Socialization After Childhood, Two Essays. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Brown, William Adams. Ministerial Education in America. Vol. I of The Education of American Ministers. Edited by Mark A. May and William Adams Brown, 4 vols. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934.

Carlin, Jerome P. Lawyer's Ethics: A Survey of the New York City Bar. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966.

Child, Irwin L. "Socialization," Handbook of Social Psychology, Gardner Lindzey, editor, Vol. II. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954. Pp. 665-692.

Clark, Burton, and Martin Trow, "The Organizational Context," College Peer Groups, Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson, editors. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966. Pp. 17-65.

Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Cooley, Charles H. Human Nature and the Social Order. New York:

Dalton, Raymond Q., "A Matter of Vocation," Why I Am at the Seminary, Thomas Wersell, editor. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Press, 1962.

Demerath, N. J., III, and Phillip E. Hammond. Religion in a Social Context. New York: Random House, 1969.

Dubin, Robert. The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958.

Durkheim, Emile. Suicide. Trans. John A. Spaulding and George Simpson. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Edwards, Allen L. Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.

Ellis, John Tracy, "A Short History of Seminary Education: I--The Apostolic Age to Trent," Seminary Education in a Time of Change, James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C. S. C., editors. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965. Pp. 1-29.

Etzioni, Amitai. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1961.

Etzioni, Amitai, "Organizational Control Structure," *Handbook of Organizations*, James March, editor. Chicago: Rand-McNally, 1965. Pp. 650-674.

Feilding, Charles R., *et al*. *Education for Ministry*. Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1966.

Festinger, Leon, *et al*. *Social Pressures in Informal Groups*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Fichter, Joseph H., S. J. *Religion as an Occupation*. South Bend, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1961.

Fletcher, Joseph. *Situation Ethics*. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1966.

Flexner, Abraham. *Medical Education, A Comparative Study*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.

Foote, Nelson, and Leonard S. Cottrell. *Identity and Interpersonal Competence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Ginsberg, Eli, *et al*. *Occupational Choice*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1951.

Glock, Charles, and Rodney Stark. *Religion and Society in Tension*. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1965.

________, Benjamin Ringer, and Earl Babbie. *To Comfort and to Challenge*: *A Dilemma of the Contemporary Church*. Berkeley, California: The University of California Press, 1967.

Goffman, Erving. *Asylums, Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1961.

________, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

Gouldner, Alvin W. (ed.). *Studies in Leadership*: *Leadership and Democratic Action*. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.

Green Burt. "Attitude Measurement," *Handbook of Social Psychology*, Gardner Lindzey, editor, Vol. I. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954. Pp. 335-369.

Greene, Graham. *The Power and the Glory*. New York: The Viking Press, 1962.

Gustafson, James. "Christian Ethics," Religion, Paul Ramsey, editor. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965. Pp. 287-354.

________, Treasure in Earthen Vessels. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. The Gathering Storm in the Churches. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1969.

Hammond, Phillip E. The Campus Clergyman. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Hardy, Edward Roche. "Priestly Ministries in the Modern Church," The Ministry in Historical Perspective, H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel Day Williams, editors. New York: Harper and Row, 1956. Pp. 149-179.

Hartshorne, Hugh, and Milton Froyd. Theological Education in the Northern Baptist Convention. Philadelphia: The Judson Press, 1945.

Hays, William L. Statistics for Psychologists. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Holmer, Paul. "Can We Educate Ministers Scientifically?" The Making of Ministers, Essays on Clergy Training Today, Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, eds., Minneapolis: Agusburg Publishing House, 1964. Pp. 2-28.

Hughes, Everett C. Men and Their Work. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1958.

Janowitz, Morris. The Professional Soldier. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1960.

Kelly, Robert. Theological Education in America. New York: George H. Doran Company, 1924.

Kendall, Patricia L., and Paul F. Lazarsfeld. "The Relationship Between Individual and Group Characteristics in 'The American Soldier,'" The Language of Social Research, Paul F. Lazersfeld and Morris Rosenberg, editors. New York: The Free Press, 1955. Pp. 290-296.

Klapp, Orrin E. Collective Search for Identity. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

Klausner, Samuel. Psychiatry and Religion. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Kornhauser, William. Scientists in Industry. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Kuhn, Thomas. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F., and Wagner Thielens, Jr. The Academic Mind. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.

Lee, James Michael and Louis J. Putz C. S. C. (eds.). Seminary Education in a Time of Change. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965.

Lee, Robert. The Social Sources of Church Unity. New York: Abingdon Press, 1960.

Lehmann, Paul L. Ethics in a Christian Context. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Lenski, Gerhard. The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1963.

Lipset, S. M. Political Man. New York: Doubleday,1960.

________, and Mildred A. Swartz. "The Politics of Professionals," Professionalization, Howard M. Vollmer and Donald L. Mills, editors. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966. Pp. 299-310.

Littell, Franklin H. "Protestant Seminary Education in America," Seminary Education in a Time of Change, James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C. S. C., editors. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965. Pp. 534-553.

Luckmann, Thomas. The Invisible Religion. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.

Mannheim, Karl. Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. Trans. Edward Shils. London: Kegan Paul, French, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1940.

Marty, Martin. "Cultural Education is Pre-Theological," The Making of Ministers, Keith R. Bridston and Dwight W. Culver, editors. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1964. Pp. 131-146.

May, Mark A. The Institutions That Train Ministers. Vol. III of The Education of American Ministers, Mark A. May and William A. Brown, editors. 4 vols. New York: Institute of Social and Religious Research, 1934.

McKenzie, John L., S. J. "Theology in the Seminary Curriculum," Seminary Education in a Time of Change, James Michael Lee and Louis J. Putz, C. S. C., editors. Notre Dame, Indiana: Fides Press, 1965. Pp. 405-428.

Mead, George Herbert. On Social Psychology, Selected Papers, Anselm Strauss, editor. Chicago: Phoenix Books, 1964.

Mead, Sidney E. "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America (1607-1850)," The Ministry in Historical Perspective, H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel Day Williams, editors. New York: Harper and Row, 1956. Pp. 207-249.

Merton, Robert K., George G. Reader, M. D., and Patricia Kendall (eds.). The Student Physician. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957.

Michaelson, Robert W. "The Protestant Ministry in America: 1850 to the Present," The Ministry in Historical Perspective, H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel Day Williams, editors. New York: Harper and Row, 1956. Pp. 250-287.

Mills, Edgar W., Jr. Career Change Among Ministers: A Socio-Psychological Study. Harvard Studies in Career Development No. 46, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for Research in Careers, May, 1966.

Neal, Sister Marie Augusta, S. N. D. Values and Interests in Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic. New York: Living Age Books, 1929.

________, This Ministry: The Contribution of Henry Sloan Coffin. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1945.

Niebuhr, H. Richard, Daniel Day Williams, and James M. Gustafson. The Advancement of Theological Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

________, Christ and Culture. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

________, The Kingdom of God in America. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1937.

________, The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Novak, Michael. "The New Relativism in American Theology," *The Religious Situation: 1958*, Donald Cutler, editor. Boston: Beacon Press, 1968. Pp. 197-231.

Outka, Gene H. and Paul Ramsey (eds.). *Norm and Context in Christian Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott. "Christianity and Modern Industrial Society," *Sociological Theory, Values, and Sociocultural Change*, Edward A. Tiryakian, editor. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1963. Pp. 33-70.

________, "An Outline of the Social System," *Theories of Society*, Talcott Parsons, *et al*., editors, Vol. I. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961. Pp. 30-79.

________, *Essays in Sociological Theory*, revised edition. New York: The Free Press, 1954.

________, *The Social System*. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

________, and Edward A. Shils (eds.). *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Pauck, Wilhelm. "The Ministry in the Time of the Continental Reformation," *The Ministry in Historical Perspective*, H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel Day Williams, editors. New York: Harper and Row, 1956. Pp. 110-148.

Poll, Solomon. *The Hasidic Community of Williamsburg*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Pope, Liston. *Millhands and Preachers*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942.

Ramsey, Paul. *Deeds and Rules in Christian Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Reiss, Albert J., *et al*. *Occupation and Social Status*. New York The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Riley, Matilda W., *et al*. *Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Robinson, John A. T. *Christian Morals Today*. Philadelphia: The Westminister Press, 1964.

Roszak, Theodore. *The Making of a Counter Culture*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969.

Selltiz, Claire, et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Selvin, Hanan C., and Warren O. Hagstrom. "The Empirical Classification of Formal Groups," College Peer Groups, Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson, editors. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966. Pp. 162-189.

Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Silone, Ignazio. Bread and Wine. New York: Signet Books, 1946.

Smith, Timothy. Revivalism and Social Reform. New York: Harper Torchbook, 1965.

Smelser, Neil J. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: The Free Press, 1962.

Smith, Charles Merrill. How to Become a Bishop Without Being Religious. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1965.

Stark, Rodney, and Charles G. Glock. American Piety: The Nature of Religious Commitment. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. "Social Structure and Organizations," Handbook of Organizations, James G. March, editor. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Super Donald. The Psychology of Careers. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Sutton, Francis X., et al. The American Business Creed. New York: Schocken Books, 1962.

Tannenbaum, Arnold S., and Jerald G. Bachman. "Structural Versus Individual Effects," Control in Organizations, Arnold S. Tannenbaum, editor. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1968, Pp. 185-197.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. Democracy in America. Trans. Henry Reeve, and revised and edited by Phillips Bradley. 2 vols. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1945.

Underwood, Kenneth. The Church, the University and Social Policy. 2 vols. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1969.

Vallier, Ivan. "Religious Specialists: Sociological Study," International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, XII, pp. 444-453, New York; Crowell, Collier and MacMillan, 1968.

Wach, Joachim. The Sociology of Religion. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.

Wagoner, Walter D. Bachelor of Divinity. New York: Association Press, 1963.

________, The Seminary, Protestant and Catholic. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

Walker, Daniel D. The Human Problems of the Minister. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Walzer, Michael. The Revolution of the Saints, A Study in the Origins of Radical Politics. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Warkov, Seymour, with Joseph Zelan. Lawyers in the Making. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Weber, Max. The Sociology of Religion. Trans. Ephriam Fischoff. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Whitley, Oliver Reid. Religious Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Williams, George H. (ed.). The Harvard Divinity School. Boston: Beacon Press, 1954.

Wilson, Everett K. "The Entering Student: Attributes and Agents of Change," College Peer Groups, Theodore M. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson, editors. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966. Pp. 71-106.

Wilson, J. Christy (ed.). Ministers in Training: A Review of Field Work Procedures in Theological Education. Princeton: Theological Book Agency, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1957.

Winter, Gibson. The Suburban Captivity of the Church. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1961.

Zetterberg, Hans. On Theory and Verification in Sociology. Totowa, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1963.

B. PERIODICALS AND MISCELLANEOUS PUBLISHED MATERIALS

Allen, Philip J. "Childhood Backgrounds of Success in a Profession," American Sociological Review, XX (Arpil, 1955), pp. 186-190.

Andrews, Kenneth. "The Progress of Professional Education for Business," Theological Education, V (Spring, 1969), pp. 144-166.

"Antiwar Movement Making Gains Among Seminarians," The New York Times, March 3, 1968, p. 1.

Bagby, Stradman. "Conservative vs. Liberal Views: A Chasm Needs a Bridge," Christian Advocate, (February 10, 1966), pp. 9-10.

Barber, Bernard. "Some Problems in the Sociology of the Professions," Daedalus, XCII (Fall, 1963), pp. 669-688.

Becker, Howard S., and James Carper. "The Elements of Identification with an Occupation," American Sociological Review, XXI (June, 1956), pp. 341-347.

Bellah, Robert N. "Religious Evolution," American Sociological Review, XXIX (June, 1964), pp. 358-374.

Berger, Peter. "Religious Establishment and Theological Education," Theology Today, XIX (July, 1962), pp. 178-191.

________, "A Sociological View of the Secularization of Theology," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, VI (Spring, 1967), pp. 3-16.

Blakemore, W. Barnett. "The Nature and Structure of the Practical Field," Journal of Religion, XXIX (October, 1949), pp. 284-300.

Blau, Peter, "Structural Effects," American Sociological Review, XXV (April, 1960), pp. 178-193.

Blizzard, Samuel W. "The Minister's Dilemma," Christian Century, (April 25, 1956), pp. 508-509.

________, "The Parish Minister's Self-Image of His Master Role," Pastoral Psychology, IX (December, 1958), pp. 25-32.

________, "The Protestant Minister's Integrating Roles," Religious Education, LIII (July-August, 1958), pp. 374-380.

Blizzard, Samuel W. "The Roles of the Rural Parish Minister, the Protestant Seminaries, and the Sciences of Social Behavior," *Religious Education*, L (November-December, 1955), pp. 383-392.

Bucher, Rue, and Anselm Strauss, "Professions in Process," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXVI (January, 1961), pp. 325-334.

Burchard, Waldo. "Role Conflicts of Military Chaplains," *American Sociological Review*, XIX (October, 1954), pp. 528-535.

Campbell, Ernest Q. "The Internalization of Moral Norms," *Sociometry*, XXVII (December, 1964), pp. 391-412.

________, and Thomas F. Pettigrew. "Racial and Moral Crisis: The Role of Little Rock Ministers," *The American Journal of Sociology*, LXIV (March, 1959), pp. 509-516.

Carr, Aute L. (ed.). *Directory of Theological Schools*. Dayton, Ohio: American Association of Theological Schools, 1968.

Cavers, Donald. "Legal Education in a Time of Change," *Theological Education*, V (Spring, 1969), pp. 170-196.

Chicago Theological Seminary Register, LX (November, 1965).

Cogan, Morris L. "Toward a Definition of Profession," *Harvard Educational Review*, XXIII (Winter, 1953), pp. 33-50.

Cogley, John. "Churchmen Are in the Social Avant Garde," *The New York Times*, (October 23, 1966), Section E, p. 5.

Cushman, Robert E. "Theological Education, A Reconsideration of Its Nature in Light of Its Objective," *The Duke Divinity School Review*, XXXIII (Winter, 1968), pp. 3-13.

Davis, James A., Joseph L. Spaeth, and Carolyn Huson. "A Technique for Analyzing the Effects of Group Composition," *American Sociological Review*, XXVI (April, 1961), pp. 215-225.

Duncan, Otis D., and Beverly Duncan. "A Methodological Analysis of Segregation Indices," *American Sociological Review*, XX (April, 1955), pp. 210-217.

The Emory Magazine, XLV (May-June, 1969), pp. 38-39.

Fiske, Edward B. "Seminaries Are Going Secular," *The New York Times*, January 29, 1967, Section E, p. 7.

Foote, Nelson. "Identification as the Basis for a Theory of Motivation," *American Sociological Review*, XVI (February, 1951), pp. 14-22.

Garrett Theological Seminary *Newsletter*, October, 1969.

Goode, W. J. "Community Within A Community: The Professions," *American Sociological Review*, XX (1957), pp. 194-200.

________, "Towards a Theory of Role Strain," *American Sociological Review*, XXV (August, 1960), pp. 483-496.

Goodman, Leo A., and William H. Kruskal. "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, XLIX (December, 1954), pp. 747-754.

Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," *American Sociological Review*, XXX (August, 1968), pp. 518-544.

Gustafson, James. "Context Versus Principles: A Misplaced Debate," *Harvard Theological Review*, LVIII (April, 1965), pp. 171-202.

________, "Theological Education as Professional Education," *Theological Education*, V (Spring, 1969), pp. 243-261.

Hadden, Jeffrey K. "A Protestant Paradox--Divided They Merge," *Trans-action* (July-August, 1967), pp. 63-69.

________, "A Study of the Protestant Ministry of America," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, V (Spring, 1965), pp. 10-23.

Hammond, Phillip E., and Robert E. Mitchell. "Segmentation of Radicalism--the Case of the Protestant Campus Minister," *American Journal of Sociology*, LXXI (September, 1965), pp. 133-143.

Hiltner, Seward. "The Teaching of Practical Theology in the United States During the Twentieth Century," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin*, LXI (Autumn, 1967), pp. 61-75.

Holcomb, Walter L., and John L. Maes. "Functional Roles, Professional Identity, and Theological Curricula," *Theological Education*, II (Spring, 1966), pp. 190-196.

Hughes, Everett. "Professions," *Daedalus*, XCII (Fall, 1963), pp. 655-668.

Johnson, Benton. Theology and Party Preference Among Protestant Clergymen," *American Sociological Review*, XXI (Spril, 1966), pp. 200-208.

Klausner, Samuel. "The Religio-Psychiatric Movement: Changing Ideology of the Movement," Review of Religious Research, VI (Fall, 1964), pp. 7-22.

________, "The Religio-Psychiatric Movement: Participation by Protestant, Catholic, and Jew," Review of Religious Research, V (Spring, 1964), pp. 63-74.

Lawrence, H. James. "The Duke Silent Vigil," The Duke Divinity School Review, XXXIII (Spring, 1968), pp. 89-108.

Lindenthal, Jacob J. "The Delayed Decision to Enter the Ministry: Some Issues and Prospects," Review of Religious Research, IX (Winter, 1968), pp. 108-114.

________, "Entrance Into the Ministry at Two Points in Life: Some Findings," Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, VII (Fall, 1968), pp. 284-285.

Lortie, Dan C. "Laymen to Lawman: Law School, Careers, and Professional Socialization," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (Fall, 1959), pp. 363-367.

Los Angeles Baptist Seminary Catalogue, Los Angeles, 1965.

Merton, Robert K. "The Role-Set: Problems in Sociological Theory," British Journal of Sociology, VIII (June, 1957), pp. 106-120.

Nasatir, David. "A Note on Contextual Effects and the Political Orientation of University Students," American Sociological Review, XXXIII (April, 1968), pp. 210-219.

"The New Ministry: Bringing God Back to Life," Time, XCIX (December, 26, 1969), pp. 40-45.

Osborn, Robert T. "Docetic Heresy in Methodism Today," Christian Advocate (February 8, 1968), pp. 7-8.

Pearson, Roy. "Trouble in the Seminaries," The Christian Century, LXXV (April 24, 1968), pp. 512-515.

Phenix, Philip. "A Functional Approach to the Understanding of Ministry," Theological Education, IV (Autumn, 1967), pp. 528-542.

Phillips Seminary Faculty. "A Plea for Multiple Strategies in Theological Education," Theological Education, V (Winter, 1969), pp. 112-118.

Potvin, Raymond H., and Antanas Suziedelis. "Seminarians of the Sixties," National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, LXV (August, 1969), pp. 44-49.

Pusey, Nathan. "Culture, Education and the Church," Humanity, III (December, 1966), pp. 1-4.

Putney, Snell, and Russell Middleton. "Rebellion, Conformity, and Parental Religious Ideologies," Sociometry, XXIV (June, 1961), pp. 125-135.

Ranck, James G. "Some Personality Correlates of Theological Conservatism and Liberalism," The Drew Gateway, XXVII (Winter, 1957), pp. 59-70.

Reid, Clyde. "Supervising Seminary Field Work," Christian Century, LXXX (April 24, 1963), pp. 528-530.

Rhenman, Eric. "Organizational Goals," Acta Sociologica, X (Fasc. 3-4, 1967), pp. 275-287.

Rueschmayer, Dietrich. "Doctors and Lawyers: A Comment on the Theory of the Professions," Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, I (February, 1964), pp. 17-30.

Scherer, Ross P. "The Lutheran Ministry: Origins, Careers, Self-Appraisal," Information Service, XLII (April 27, 1963), pp. 1-8.

Scott, Ronald Bodley. "The Doctor in Contemporary Literature," The Lancet, CCLXIX (August 13, 1955), pp. 341-343.

Sewell, William H. "Some Recent Developments in Socialization Theory and Research," The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 349 (September, 1963), pp. 163-181.

Shaull, Richard. "The Challenge to the Seminary," Christianity and Crisis, XXIX (April 14, 1969), pp. 81-86.

Shriver, Donald. "Standing Between the Structures," The Duke Divinity School Review, XXXIII (Autumn, 1968), pp. 182-195.

Smith, Luke M. "The Clergy; Authority Sturcture, Ideology, Migration," American Sociological Review, XVIII (June, 1953), pp. 242-248.

St. Paul School of Theology. "Relevant Ministry Through Radical Involvement." Printed brochure. (No date).

"Theological Curriculum for the 1970's," Theological Education, IV (Spring, 1968), pp. 671-726.

Trotter, F. Thomas. "The Modern Seminary: A Mixture of Three Models," The Christian Advocate, X (July 14, 1966), pp. 7-8.

Union Theological Seminary Catalogue, New York, 1966-67.

Ward, Ronald L. "The Relevance of Ministerial Training," Religion in Life, XXV (Winter, 1955-56), pp. 55-64.

Whitman, Ardis. "The View from the Pulpit," McCall's, (February, 1968), pp. 83, 145-150.

Wilson, Bryan R. "The Pentecostalist Minister: Role Conflicts and Status Contradictions," American Journal of Sociology, LXIV (1959), pp. 494-504.

Wise, Carroll. "The Call to the Ministry," Pastoral Psychology. IX (December, 1958), pp. 7-17.

Wrong, Dennis. "The Oversocialized Conception of Man," American Sociological Review, XXVI (April, 1961), pp. 183-192.

Yale Divinity School Bulletin, Series 62, April, 1966.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Becker, Edwin L. "Religious Field Work as Experience in the Social Roles of the Minister: A Sociological Study of the Meaning of Religious Field Work in the Divinity School of Yale University." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, 1956.

Carroll, Jackson W. "Some Insights into History and Historicity from the Perspective of Sociology." Unpublished paper, Atlanta, Georgia, 1969. (Mimeographed).

Coxon, Anthony P. M. "Sociological Processes of Clergy Selection." Unpublished paper presented at Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey, May, 1969.

________, "A Sociological Study of the Social Recruitment, Selection and Professional Socialization of Anglican Ordinands." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leeds, Leeds, England, 1965.

Donovan, J. D. "The Catholic Priest: A Study in the Sociology of the Professions." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University. Cambridge, 1951.

Girling, Paul A. "A Study of Values Held by American Theological Students." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Colorado State College, Boulder, Colorado, 1968.

Kling, Frederick W., "The Motivation of Ministerial Candidates," Educational Testing Service Research Bulletin, 59-2, Princeton, New Jersey, 1959. (Mimeographed).

Lovell, John P. "From Seminary to University: Organizational Change at the Nation's Service Academies." Unpublished Working Paper #27, Center for Social Organization Studies, University of Chicago, May, 1964.

Moore, Wilbert E., with Gerald Rosenblum. _The Professions in Modern Society_. Unpublished manuscript of a forthcoming book.

Oliver, Hoyt A. "Professional Authority and the Professional Ministry: A Study of an Occupational Image." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, New Haven, 1966.

Peterson, Richard E. "On a Typology of College Students." Research Bulletin, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey, March, 1965.

Ploch, Donald R. "Socialization and Social Change: A Study of the Causes of Change in the Socialization Process." Unpublished paper, University of North Carolina, 1965.

Simpson, Ida Harper. "The Development of Professional Self Images Among Student Nurses." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1956.

Wagenschein, Miriam. "Reality Shock." Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Chicago, Chicago, 1951.

Webber, George W. "Vision for a Seminary," Unpublished paper, New York Theological Seminary, April 21, 1969. (Mimeographed).

Wilson, Alan B. "A Comparison of Three Modes of Analysis of Survey Data." Unpublished paper, Berkeley, California, no date. (Mimeographed).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

In Chapter Four, it was indicated that two mailed questionnaires were used for this study. The first, used in the Danforth Study of Campus Ministries, has been published elsewhere[1] and is not included here. The items selected from the Danforth questionnaire to construct the various scales used in this study are listed below in Appendix C. In the following pages of Appendix A, there is reproduced the follow-questionnaire which was used to gather additional data regarding the seminary experience of the ministers.

---

[1] Underwood, The Church, The University, and Social Policy, Vol. I, *op. cit.*, pp. 555-601.

A QUESTIONNAIRE ON
PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

2240

INSTRUCTIONS:

Please answer all questions. Many of them can be answered by placing a check on a line to the left of one of the numbered answers under each question, or by circling a number on a scale indicating the answer that most nearly represents your own view. Instructions are included with each question as to the way in which it should be answered.

In some cases, you may not feel that any of the alternatives really expresses your position. Nevertheless, please check or circle the one answer nearest to your position; then note any comments whi[illegible] may have at the end of the questionnaire.

The small numbers in the margins and next to the answer categories have been placed there to facilitate data processing. Disregard them in answering.

The first few questions are concerned with your decision to enter the ministry and with those who were especially helpful to you in working through your decision.

1. Please try to recall the time in your life when: (check one answer in each column) (1-2)

A. You first considered entering the ministry:
- __1) Before high school
- __2) During high school
- __3) Between high school and college
- __4) During college
- __5) After college

B. You decided to enter the ministry
- __1) Before high school
- __2) During high school
- __3) Between high school and college
- __4) During college
- __5) After college, but before seminary
- __6) During seminary

2. Your age when you first considered the ministry?_____ (3-4)

3. Your age at the time of deciding to enter the ministry?_____ (5-6)

4. Did you every engage full time in any other occupation? Yes____(1); No____(2) (7)
If yes, for how many years?_______ (8-9)

5. Thinking back to your decision to enter the ministry, how helpful were the following persons as you worked through your decision? (Check one answer for each person) (10-19)

	(1) Very Helpful	(2) Fairly Helpful	(3) Not very Helpful	(4) Discouraged Me	(5) Does Not Apply
1) Your father	○	○	○	○	○
2) Your mother	○	○	○	○	○
3) Home pastor	○	○	○	○	○
4) Campus minister	○	○	○	○	○
5) Your wife	○	○	○	○	○
6) Youth counselor	○	○	○	○	○
7) Denominational leader	○	○	○	○	○
8) A friend	○	○	○	○	○
9) Military chaplain	○	○	○	○	○

0) Other (please specify)______________________________

6. Of those persons listed above, which one of them would you say had the most significant influence on your decision to enter the ministry? (Write in the appropriate number from the left margin in Q. 5) ________ (20)

The next few questions ask you for some personal information about yourself.

7. Your present age?____(21-2) 8. Your present denomination__________________(23-24)

9. If your present denomination is not the first denomination you joined, then write in the name of the first denomination.________________________(25-26)

10. Admittedly it is difficult to describe one's religious commitment on a scale; nevertheless, please try to circle the number from 1(uncommitted) to 5 (deeply committed) which best describes your degree of commitment through high school. (27)

Uncommitted Deeply Committed

1 2 3 4 5

11. Now, how would you characterize your participation in the church and other religious activities through high school, using a similar scale from 1 (no participation) to 5(very active participation.) (28)

No Participation Very Active Participation

1 2 3 4 5

11. What is (or was) the principal occupation of your father or head of household. Please be as specific as possible. (Write your answer below) (29-31)

____

Type of employer or firm (NOT THE SPECIFIC NAME, but the general type, such as "state government", or "aircraft factory", or "self-employed, small retail grocery"):

____

____

12. What is (or was) the principal occupation of your paternal grandfather? (32-34)

____

Type of employer or firm (as in question 11): ________________

____

13. Were your parents ever separated or divorced? Yes____(1); No___(2) (35)

14. Is your father living? Yes____(1) (36)
No_____(2)

If no, how old were you when he died? ______ (37-38)

15. Is your mother living? Yes____(1) (39)
No_____(2)

If no, how old were you when she died?_______ (40-41)

16. How would you describe the participation of each of your parents in the life of the church? (Check one response for each parent) (42-43)

	A. Father	B. Mother
1) No participation	○	○
2) Nominal participation	○	○
3) Moderate participation	○	○
4) Active participation	○	○
5) Very active participation	○	○

17. From what type of undergraduate school did you graduate? (Check one) (44)

__1) Public college
__2) Public university
__3) Private non-denominational college
__4) Private non-denominational university
__5) Church-related college
__6) Church-related university
__7) Other (specify)______________
____

18. What was your over-all grade average (approximate) during college? (Check one)

__1) A
__2) A-
__3) B+
__4) B
__5) B-
__6) C+
__7) C
__8) C-.
__9) D+ or below

(45)

19. What was your undergraduate major? (Please check the field) (46)

__1) Language/Literature
__2) Religion/Philosophy
__3) Art/Music/Drama
__4) Sociology/ Psych/Anthrop.
__5) Biol. or physical science
__6) Engineering
__7) Econ./Business Admin.
__8) Pol. Sci./History
__9) Other (specify)______________________

20. How would you describe your involvement during college in the following types of organizations or activities? (Check the appropriate column for each type of activity) (47-55)

	(1) Not Involved	(2) A Participant	(3) Highly Involved	(4) Highly Involved & a leader
Campus Religious group	○	○	○	○
Social action projects	○	○	○	○
Music or drama groups	○	○	○	○
Social fraternity	○	○	○	○
Student government	○	○	○	○
Pre-ministerial group	○	○	○	○
Athletic organization	○	○	○	○
Campus publications	○	○	○	○
Other (specify)________________				

In the questions that follow, information about your seminary experience is desired. Please answer in relation to the seminary from which you received the B.D., unless other directions are given. In answering some of these questions, it will be necessary for you to refresh your memory about your seminary years.

21. Name and location of seminary from which you received your B.D.

____________________________(56-57)

22. Year of graduation?_____(58-59)

23. What other seminaries have you attended as a full-time student? (name and location) (60-61)

____

____

24. Please check the degrees you have earned to date, beyond the B.D.

__1) ThM __3)PhD
__2) MA or MS __4)ThD (62-65)

25. How much would you say that you actually knew about the seminary you attended prior to your actual enrollment? (Please check one) (66)

___1) Quite a lot ___2) Some knowledge ___3) Very little

26. What would you say was the most important factor in your choice of the seminary you attended? (Please check one) (67)

__1) Financial Aid
__2) Location
__3) Reputation
__4) Denominational Affiliation
__5) Non-denominational affiliation
__6) Advice of denominational leaders
__7) Friends already attending or planning to attend.
__8) Other (specify)______________________

27. If you could have had your choice of attending any seminary (i.e., if such factors as costs, admissions policies, denominational requirements, etc.) had not been factors in your decision, would you have attended a seminary other than the one you attended? Yes____(1); No____(2). If yes, what is the name and location of the one you would have attended?______________________

______________________________________ (68)-(69-70)

28. During the majority of the time you were in seminary, in which one of the following types of housing did you live? (Please check one) (71)
___1) Dormitory, primarily with fellow seminary students
___2) Dormitory, primarily with students from other disciplines
___3) Married student housing provided by the seminary
___4) Off campus housing, not provided by the seminary

29. As you worked out your ways of being a student, which of the following did you find most helpful when you wished to talk over your problems? (Check one)
___1) Senior faculty
___2) Younger faculty
___3) Upper classmen
___4) Members of your own class
___5) A pastor (not on the seminary staff)
___6) Former college professors (72)
Other (please specify)________________________________

30. What was your major field of interest during seminary? (Check one) II (1)
__1) Biblical
__2) Historical
__3) Theological
__4) Ethics & Society
__5) Pastoral Care
__6) Church Administration
__7) Religion & the Arts
__8) Christian Education
__9) Homiletics & Liturgics
Other (Specify) ________________________________

31. What was your approximate over-all grade average during seminary? (Check one)
__1) A
__2) A-
__3) B+
__4) B
__5) B-
__6) C+
__7) C
__8) C-
__9) D+ or below (2)

32. During seminary, to what degree did you participate in the activities below? (Rank each activity by circling a number from "regularly" to "never") (3-9)

	Regularly				Never
Cultural events in the community.......	1	2	3	4	5
Social & political action groups.......	1	2	3	4	5
Classes and/or lectures in secular disciplines outside the seminary.....	1	2	3	4	5
Corporate worship in the seminary......	1	2	3	4	5
Informal faculty contacts..............	1	2	3	4	5
Ecumenical Activities..................	1	2	3	4	5
Denominational activities..............	1	2	3	4	5

33. Think back to your five or ten closest friends during seminary. For each of the following activities, indicate its importance in the mutual fellowship you found together. (Rank each activity by circling a number from "highly" important" to "no importance") (10-14)

	Highly Important				No Importance
Studying together......................	1	2	3	4	5
Social Life and recreation.............	1	2	3	4	5
Participation in social action projects.	1	2	3	4	5
Bull sessions..........................	1	2	3	4	5
Common worship and prayer..............	1	2	3	4	5

34. While a seminary student, what types of field education experience did you have? (Check as many as apply) (15-18)
___1) None
___2) Pastor of a church
___3) Assistant pastor
___4) Church school teacher
___5) Youth counselor
___6) Community or other social services
___7) Campus ministry
___8) Other (specify)____________________

In every theological school, students and faculty hold a variey of attitudes about the purpose of theological education. Such attitudes may be thought of as personal perspectives on theological education. The following paragraphs are descriptive of four such perspectives, which, though not excluding each other, reflect differences of emphasis. Please read through the statements carefully; then answer the questions that follow.

PERSPECTIVE A: This perspective places primary emphasis on the importance of mastering the basic substantive areas of the Christian tradition, such as biblical studies, church history, historical theology, and systematic theology. While practical competence is not unimportant, the need of the church is seen to be for ministers who are competent scholars, firmly grounded in the Christian tradition. Therefore, encounter in depth with this tradition is the major purpose of the seminary experience.

PERSPECTIVE B: The task of the ministry has become so complex and demanding that, while it is not unimportant to gain a mastery of the tradition, one cannot leave to "trial and error" the theory and practice of the ministry. Thus, in this perspective, primary importance is given to gaining professional competence in the various aspects of ministerial practice, such as pastoral care, Christian education, homiletics and liturgics, etc.

PERSPECTIVE C: Although the intellectual and professional aspects of ministry cannot be neglected in seminary, neither is as basic for the seminarian as the deepening of his own spiritual life and commitment. Thus, those holding this perspective view the seminary years as a primary opportunity for the deepening of this experience in Christian community. Great importance is placed on opportunities for spiritual growth, such as personal devotions, corporate worship and prayer.

PERSPECTIVE D: This perspective, too, does not neglect the importance of the other emphases; however, it stems from a profound sense of the need for the church and ministry to be aware of and involved in the world in a relevant way. Therefore, courses in various secular disciplines, and social action projects and field education experiences which involve the student "where the action is" are sought out as important means of learning to minister in today's world.

Having read through these statements, please answer the following questions:

35. First, think back to your own views during seminary. Which of the perspectives best describes your orientation to theological education while you were in seminary. Assign it the rank of 1. Then, assign ranks of 2, 3, and 4 to the remaining perspectives in the order of their importance to you. (19-22)

Perspective A	Perspective B	Perspective C	Perspective D
(__)	(__)	(__)	(__)

36. Next, try to recall your five or ten closest friends during seminary (those with whom you spent the most time. Taken as a whole, how would they have ranked the four perspectives? (Rank as above) (23-26)

Perspective A	Perspective B	Perspective C	Perspective D
(__)	(__)	(__)	(__)

37. Finally, taken as a whole, how would you say that the faculty members whom you admired most in seminary would have ranked the perspectives? (27-30)

Perspective A	Perspective B	Perspective C	Perspective D
(__)	(__)	(__)	(__)

38. In general, how would your describe the attitude of your seminary faculty to the institutional church? (Please check one) (31)

__1) Very supportive
__2) Moderately supportive
__3) Moderately critical
__4) Very critical

39. On the whole, how widely used were each of the following methods of teaching in your seminary? (Please check one answer for each type) (32-36)

	(1) Widely Used	(2) Occasionally Used	(3) Rarely or Never Used
Formal class lectures	○	○	○
Seminars	○	○	○
Independent study	○	○	○
Supervised ministry	○	○	○
Class field trips	○	○	○

40. How would you say your seminary education was helpful in preparing you to deal with the following issues? (Circle the best response for each) (37-42)

	Quite Helpful				Not Helpful at All
The minister's role within the church	1	2	3	4	5
The minister's role in local social, political and economic structures	1	2	3	4	5
Issues relating to civil rights and minority groups	1	2	3	4	5
Issues confronting urban areas	1	2	3	4	5
Problems of automation and technology	1	2	3	4	5
Issues relating to international relations	1	2	3	4	5

(43-45)

41. (Check one response in each column) What type of ministry or other occupation:

	A. Did you enter at graduation?	B. Were you eventually planning to enter?	C. Are you engaged in now?
1) Parish minister	○	○	○
2) Assoc. minister	○	○	○
3) Minister of Education	○	○	○
4) College or Seminary Teaching	○	○	○
5) Military Chaplain	○	○	○
6) Institutional Chaplain	○	○	○
7) Denominational Admin.	○	○	○
8) Ecumenical Affairs	○	○	○
9) Missions (home or world)	○	○	○
0) Other (specify)	________	________	________

Finally, here are a few questions concerning the present.

42 Labels are never satisfactory; however, please indicate below how you would describe your social/ethical perspective at each of the points in time listed. (Check one answer for each point in time) (46-49)

	(1) Very Conservative	(2) Conservative	(3) Moderate	(4) Liberal	(5) Very Liberal
On entering college	○	○	○	○	○
On entering seminary	○	○	○	○	○
On leaving seminary	○	○	○	○	○
At the present time	○	○	○	○	○

43. Listed below are several statements representing "images of the ministry" which are expressive of various ways in which ministers might define the major purpose of their ministry. While you may be in general agreement with a number of the statements, try to indicate, on the scale provided, the degree to which each statement is an important emphasis in the way you define your ministry. (Note that the scale has six possible choices, from 1 -- "of little importance" to 6 -- "of major importance". The solid vertical is simply to indicate the mid-point on the scale. Circle one response for each statement.) (50-57)

	Of Little Importance					Of Major Importance
...The minister conserves and interprets the heritage of the Christian tradition......	1	2	3	4	5	6
...The minister is called to "be where the action is", and to join with those who are working for justice and love............	1	2	3	4	5	6
...Through the witness of his words and life, the minister brings people to a personal knowledge of Christ and to a consciousness of His Lordship in everyday Christian living.........................	1	2	3	4	5	6
...The minister is no different from any Christian except that he has special training which equips him to coordinate the work of the church......................	1	2	3	4	5	6
...As a Christian, one is called to make of the ministry whatever is necessary in order to communicate the Gospel to the needs of our day...........................	1	2	3	4	5	6
...In last analysis, the ministry is not so much something that one does, but rather is a calling to a particular state of life...	1	2	3	4	5	6
...Through faithful study of the Word of God and a life of personal devotion, the minister leads people to a deeper faith in God.....................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
...The minister's calling is to place himself in the service of persons, whoever they may be, to help them cope with their problems and find health and joy............	1	2	3	4	5	6

44. In recent months, many ministers have expressed publicly and privately widely differing views concerning the ministry as a vocation. Below are several of these statements. As in the previous question, please circle the number which best represents your degree of agreement or disagreement with the statements. (58-63)

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
...There are disadvantages in the ministry, but it still carries a prestige and dignity which no other profession shares.........	1	2	3	4	5	6
...The profession of clergyman is becoming an impossible burden for anyone needing a meaningful sense of vocation.............	1	2	3	4	5	6
...The ministry is the most awesome, and at the same time the most challenging of all professions..............................	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree
...The minister is a kind of "fifth" wheel, an employee of an institution that is comforting to have around but far removed from the real issues in the world............	1	2	3	4	5	6
...I can think of no more exciting work than the opportunity the ministry gives me to participate in God's history.................	1	2	3	4	5	6
...Today's laymen and clergymen face the plain fact that there is no need for an ordained professional ministry.........................	1	2	3	4	5	6

45. When others express approval or disapproval of your ministry, whose judgments do you tend to value most? (Please check one answer) (64)

___1) Your fellow ministers
___2) Denominational administrators (other than #1)
___3) Members of your congregation
___4) Former seminary professors
___5) Other (specify)______________

46. Since graduating from seminary, to what extent have you engaged in the various types of continuing education listed below? (Check one response for each type) (65-71)

	(1) Frequently	(2) Occasionally	(3) Seldom	(4) Never
Personal study	○	○	○	○
Group study with fellow clergy	○	○	○	○
Discussions with other professionals	○	○	○	○
Pastors' schools	○	○	○	○
Seminary clinics & seminars	○	○	○	○
College classes in secular disciplines	○	○	○	○
Training programs such as at the Urban Training Center	○	○	○	○
Other (please specify)______________				

This concludes the questionnaire. Thank you very much for taking the time to complete the questions. Will you please look back over the entire questionnaire to be sure that you answered all questions. If you have any comments, please use the space below or an extra sheet. Use the enclosed addressed, stamped envelope to return your questionnaire.

APPENDIX B

SAMPLING CONSIDERATIONS

Although general matters related to the sample for the study and the methods of data collection were considered in Chapter Four, it will be useful to treat some of these matters in a little more detail. Especially do I wish to focus on the question of the adequacy of the data as a representative sample, given the problems created by the sample selection.

It will be recalled that the original Danforth survey questionnaire was sent to a 25% random probability sample of parish clergy from six Protestant denominations. In addition, the entire population of campus ministers of the six denominations received questionnaires. These denominations were chosen partly because of their willingness to offer financial support for the study and also in an attempt to include as broad a range of American Protestantism as possible. As Hadden indicates, however, there are shortcomings to the sample:

> (a) sectarian religion is not included except as represented by minorities within the six denominations; (b) there is some underrepresentation of the South; and (c) Negro ministers are generally not included except as they are members of these six denominations.[1]

After five follow-up letters, a total response of 67% was received, which included 7,441 parish clergy and approximately 600 campus clergymen.[2] Hadden reports that a comparison of the first and last 500 questionnaires returned revealed no systematic differences between the early and late respondents; however, he indicates that a study of non-respondents revealed that they tended "to be somewhat older, theologically more conservative, and more likely to serve smaller churches in rural areas."[3]

---

[1] "A Study of the Protestant Ministry," p. 13.

The present study, I have already reported, is based, not on the total number of respondents to the Danforth study, but rather on a sub-sample selected from the larger body of respondents. The Danforth sample was not drawn with reference to seminary attended; however, graduates of 70 seminaries are represented among the respondents. The N's for these seminaries range from a low of one graduate to a high of 335. Since my concern was with the seminary experience, I used the two criteria previously mentioned: (1) that the seminary N be reasonably large; and (2) that the seminaries be reasonably representative as to denominational affiliation, size, location, reputation, and affiliation or lack of affiliation with a university. The respondent's age (under age 45) was also used as a basis for selection. This sub-sampling yielded 2,396 possible respondents for the follow-up. As indicated in Chapter Four, current addresses could be secured from 2,242. These received the questionnaires in April, 1968. One follow-up reminder card was mailed to non-respondents. The return of 1,584 usable responses constituted 70.4% of the actual questionnaires mailed, or 66.1% of the total selected, including those for whom no addresses were found and several who had been mistakenly classified in the Danforth study by age or seminary attended. Table 47 shows the N for each seminary selected from (1) the Danforth study (all ages), (2) the sub-sample of those under age 45 and (3) the actual usable responses received from each seminary cohort. Column four in the table shows the percentage of those from each seminary who received the questionnaire and responded.

---

[2] I have to use approximate figures, since the exact numbers were not available.

[3] The Gathering Storm in the Churches, p. 38.

Since the N's for each seminary in the Danforth sample are not a random sample of graduates of that seminary, it is impossible to estimate how representative the follow-up respondents are of their respective seminaries. The selection by age further complicates the picture, as does the attrition through non-response to the follow-up survey. Nevertheless, it can be seen from the table how the various seminaries are proportionately represented in the 66.1% total responses to the follow-up survey. The percentages returning questionnaires from the different seminaries varied from 52% to 77%. Baptist seminaries tended, with one exception, to have slightly lower response rates. This is partly attributable to a greater difficulty in locating current addresses for Baptist respondents than for the other denominations. Presbyterians, with one exception, tended to have a slightly higher return rate. This is likely due to the ties

TABLE 47

COMPARISON OF SEMINARY COHORTS IN THE DANFORTH STUDY, THE TOTAL SAMPLE DRAWN FOR THE FOLLOW-UP SEMINARY SURVEY AND THE NUMBER RESPONDING TO THE SEMINARY SURVEY

Seminary by Denomination	*Total Danforth Respondents	Total Selected For Follow-up Seminary Survey	Total Respondents to Seminary Survey	Percent Responding From Each Seminary (% based on Column 2)
	N =	N =	N =	%
Baptist	57	30	16	53
Baptist	100	50	26	52
Baptist	100	47	33	70
Baptist	48	29	15	52
ALC	133	101	70	69
ALC	342	250	176	70
ALC	165	113	82	73
Episcopal	146	91	50	55
Episcopal	118	71	49	69
Episcopal	199	127	78	61
Methodist	237	146	95	65
Methodist	155	109	70	64
Methodist	287	210	121	58
Methodist	327	188	130	69
MSL	321	218	148	68
Presbyterian	212	125	93	74
Presbyterian	317	168	124	74
Presbyterian	120	88	51	58
Interdenom.	159	97	69	71
Interdenom.	172	85	48	57
Interdemon.	83	52	40	77
Total N	3,798	2,396	1,584	66%

*These figures represent the total respondents for each seminary, regardless of age, whereas the selection in Column 2 was made of those in Column 1 who were under age 45.

of Princeton Theological Seminary (Presbyterian) to the study. While it is impossible to say more regarding the degree of bias as revealed in this table, I do not believe that serious non-response problems are indicated thus far as a result of the follow-up returns.

To attempt further to check for possible bias, several comparisons were made between the respondents to the follow-up survey by denomination and the respondents to the Danforth survey as the latter are reported by Jeffrey Hadden in The Gathering Storm in the Churches. Hadden reports the responses by denomination (and occasionally also by age) to several of the belief statements in the study. The six sub-tables of Table 48 show the comparisons. The figures in the columns represent the percentages of those responding with a score of 5 or 6 on a six-point rating scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (6). It will be noted that in all sub-tables except one (#4), the Baptists in the seminary sample are consistently significantly different (usually more liberal) from the Baptists in the Danforth survey. To a slightly lesser degree, this is also true for the Presbyterians. In fact, on most of the questions, the follow-up respondents are more liberal than the total Danforth respondents.

These differences, however, are somewhat reduced in the sub-tables of Table 49. These tables allow comparisons on two of the same belief statements shown in Table 48, with an additional control for age for the Danforth respondents. While the seminary sample remains proportionately slightly more liberal on these two belief statements than the total Danforth respondents, the differences are smaller than was true when age was not controlled.

TABLE 48

COMPARISONS OF RESPONDENTS TO THE DANFORTH SURVEY WITH RESPONDENTS TO THE FOLLOW-UP SEMINARY SURVEY BY DENOMINATION ON SELECTED BELIEF STATEMENTS*

		% Agreeing		Differences Between Danforth and Seminary Respondents
		**Danforth	Seminary	
1. "I believe in a literal or nearly literal interpretation of the Bible."	Methodist	18	12	-6%
	Presbyt.	19	8	-11
	Baptist	43	20	-23
	M.S.L.	76	64	-12
	Episcopal	11	5	-6
	A.L.C.	43	33	-10
2. "I accept Jesus' physical resurrection as an objective historical fact in the same sense that Lincoln's physical death was a historical fact."	Methodist	49	50	+1%
	Presbyt.	65	54	-11
	Baptist	67	45	-22
	M.S.L.	93	95	+2
	Episcopal	70	60	-10
	A.L.C.	87	86	-1
3. "I believe in a divine judgment after death where some shall be rewarded and others punished."	Methodist	52	47	-5%
	Presbyt.	57	40	-17
	Baptist	71	45	-26
	M.S.L.	94	94	0
	Episcopal	55	46	-9
	A.L.C.	91	91	0

TABLE 48 (continued)

		% Agreeing		Differences Between Danforth and Seminary
		**Danforth	Seminary	Respondents
4. "The Christian church can only be its true self as it exists for humanity."	Methodist	75	76	+1%
	Presbyt.	72	77	+5
	Baptist	75	83	+8
	M.S.L.	71	77	+6
	Episcopal	61	67	+5
	A.L.C.	71	75	+4
5. "Scriptures are the inspired and inerrant Word of God not only in matters of faith but also in historical, geographical and other secular matters."	Methodist	13	7	-6%
	Presbyt.	21	3	-9
	Baptist	33	9	-24
	M.S.L.	76	59	-17
	Episcopal	5	2	-3
	A.L.C.	23	15	-8
6. "I believe that the virgin birth of Jesus was a biological miracle."	Methodist	40	34	-6%
	Presbyt.	51	29	-22
	Baptist	66	42	-24
	M.S.L.	95	92	-3
	Episcopal	56	39	-17
	A.L.C.	81	81	0

*Source for Danforth data: Jeffrey Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches, op. cit., Chapter II, Tables 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 20.

**The Danforth figures are for all respondents regardless of age, whereas the Seminary figures are for those under age 45.

TABLE 49

COMPARISONS OF RESPONDENTS TO THE DANFORTH SURVEY WITH RESPONDENTS TO THE FOLLOW-UP SEMINARY SURVEY BY AGE COHORTS AND DENOMINATION ON SELECTED BELIEF STATEMENTS

		% Agreeing				
		Danforth*				Seminary
		Under 35	35-44	45-54	Over 55	Under 45
1. "I believe in a literal or nearly literal interpretation of the Bible."	Methodist	11	16	23	23	2
	Presbyt.	14	16	23	31	8
	Baptist	27	41	55	47	20
	M.L.S.	72	73	79	84	64
	Episcopal	5	11	17	14	5
	A.L.C.	24	43	60	74	33
2. "I believe that the virgin birth of Jesus was a biological miracle."	Methodist	31	43	42	48	34
	Presbyt.	38	52	57	61	29
	Baptist	58	64	75	68	42
	M.S.L.	94	95	96	98	92
	Episcopal	49	53	57	65	39
	A.L.C.	70	84	92	92	81

*Source, Hadden, The Gathering Storm in the Churches, op. cit., Chapter II, Tables 17, 18.

Two further comparisons are made in Table 50, which indicate a rather striking similarity between the actual respondents to the follow-up survey and those to whom the follow-up questionnaires were mailed. On these two items, at least, there seems to be no problem of non-response bias.

TABLE 50

COMPARISONS BETWEEN RESPONDENTS TO SEMINARY SURVEY AND THE TOTAL SAMPLE TO WHICH THE SEMINARY SURVEY WAS SENT, ON SELECTED BELIEF ITEMS

1. "The Christian church can only be its true self as it exists for humanity."

	% Definitely Disagree				% Definitely Agree		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Total Sample	7%	6	4	8	26	49	(N = 2382)
Respondents	6%	6	4	8	28	48	(N = 1584)
Difference Between Total and Respondents	-1%	0	0	0	+2	-1	

2. "I believe in a literal or nearly literal interpretation of the Bible."

	% Definitely Disagree				% Definitely Agree		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Total Sample	54%	14	5	7	10	10	(N = 2382)
Respondents	53%	14	5	7	12	9	(N = 1584)
Difference Between Total and Respondents	-1%	0	0	0	+2	-1	

In general, therefore, these comparisons lead me to the conclusion that there is no significant bias as the result of sampling, save the general tendency of the seminary (follow-up) respondents to be slightly more liberal on selected theological issues. Of course, this has reference only to a comparison of the two samples by denomination, that is, on the original criterion used for sampling. This in no way indicates how representative the sample is with reference to the major criterion for sub-sampling for the follow-up survey, that is, the seminary criterion. The respondents do not constitute a random sample of all the graduates of the seminaries during the time period covered. All that can be said in this regard is that the respondents represent a random sample of those men from the six denominations who were students in the twenty-one seminaries during the period which their years of graduation represent.

APPENDIX C

SCALES AND INDICES USED

In this Appendix, brief descriptions of the techniques of scale and index construction and of the items used in the scales and indices are given. Items used come both from the Danforth questionnaire and the follow-up seminary questionnaire (See Appendix A). In the Danforth questionnaire, I had access to the scales and indices which Jeffrey Hadden had developed out of the data for use in his analyses.[1] In the case of the primary scales used in the present study, differences in research focus made it seem wise to construct new measures. The methods utilized in scale construction and item analysis are discussed below in Section One. In several other instances, there were scales or indices which Hadden had constructed which, although not central to the purposes of the present study, proved quite useful for descriptive purposes. A description of these measures is included in Section Two below; however, I did not submit them to further item analysis, since this had already been undertaken by Hadden and since they were not central to the major purposes of the study. Section Three contains a description of the quality index.

I. PRIMARY SCALES

In the first four scales described below, the method of summated ratings or Likert scaling[2] has been used, which involves the use of a number of attitude statements selected as measuring a common underlying attitude. The responses to each statement are given in terms of weights (from one to six) indicating degrees of disagreement to agreement with the statement. These weights are then summed for each respondent to give a total score.

---

[1] "Hadden Scales," April, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

The first two scales are derived from the Danforth data. On the basis of the working definition of the variable to be measured, a number of statements from the Danforth questionnaire which seemed congruent with the definition were selected. These statements were then submitted to a panel of judges (graduate students in theology and/or theological seminary faculty) who were asked to select the items that best seemed to reflect the working definition. The items thus selected were submitted to an item analysis as suggested by Edwards.[3]

Since the Danforth data which had been selected for this study were already in hand, a score for each respondent was computed by summing the scores on the items selected by the judges. Following this, 25% of the respondents with the highest scores and 25% of the respondents with the lowest scores were constituted as criterion groups to evaluate individual items. The responses of each group on each item selected were compared. With the null hypothesis of no difference between the groups on each of the items (that is, that the item failed to discriminate between highs and lows), a t test was computed comparing each group on responses to each item selected. Edwards[4] recommends as a crude rule of thumb that, with a t value equal to or greater than 1.75, the null hypothesis of no difference between the average response of the two groups be rejected, provided that there are 25 or more subjects in each of the two groups. In the various t tests which were computed for the selection of items used in the scales, every item selected exceeded considerably this criterion. No item was used which had a t value of less than 3.0 (N = 50), or whose level of significance was greater than .001.

---

[2] Allen L. Edwards, Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957), pp. 149-171.

[3] Ibid., pp. 152-156.

In the case of the two scales constructed for the follow-up questionnaire, the same general method of scale development was followed, except that a large number of items were selected from various sources and were rated by judges on the basis of their congruency with the working definitions of the attitudes to be measured. The Edwards technique of item analysis described above was also used.

Although a fuller discussion of the definitions of the attitudes measured by the scales is included at appropriate points in the chapters where the scales are introduced, a brief statement of the definitions, followed by a listing of the items used is given below.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 153.

Theological Orientation (Chapter VII)

Items used in the scale were selected to measure theological orientations on a conservative-liberal dimension. Conservatism is defined as involving a positive orientation towards traditional or orthodox supernatural beliefs and rejection of attempts to liberalize or reinterpret traditional doctrines in light of contemporary thought and experience. Liberalism is defined as reflecting a more man-centered, Christianly humanistic orientation, in which contemporary thought and experience are taken seriously in interpreting, reinterpreting and often rejecting traditional formulations.

Items representing conservative beliefs are indicated by (C) and liberal beliefs are indicated by (L). In summing the scores for each respondent, scores on conservative (C) items were summed and subtracted from the sum of the scores on liberal items to get a total score. The items are as follows:

(C) The Christian style of life is one of contentment with one's worldly possessions, forebearance toward others, and certainty of eternal life.

(C) I believe in a literal or nearly literal interpretation of the Bible.

(C) I accept Jesus' physical resurrection as an objective historical fact in the same sense that Lincoln's physical death was a historical fact.

(C) I believe in a divine judgment after death where some shall be rewarded and others punished.

(L) Men can live creative lives in the world without believing in Jesus Christ and without despair or guilt over rejection of such belief.

(L) I do not find the concept of the Trinity to be very meaningful.

(L) There is no longer any need for God as a working hypothesis in morals, politics, science, or religion, and in the name of intellectual honesty such working hypotheses should be dropped.

(C) I believe that the virgin birth of Jesus was a biological miracle.

(L) I feel that Jesus was a great man and very holy, but I don't feel Him to be the Son of God any more than all men are the Children of God.

(C) Billy Graham is one of the best interpreters and spokesmen for the Christian faith.

(C) Adam and Eve were individual historical persons.

(L) We must try to translate the language of biblical faith into meaningful contemporary symbols because biblical faith is not rigid doctrine.

(L) Much of the traditional religious language (such as "Heavenly Father" or "Salvation") is not very meaningful to me.

(L) I believe that the principal value of prayer is that it provides a psychological outlet for pent-up emotions.

Ethical Orientation (Chapter VIII)

The attitude measured by this scale is defined as lying on a continuum between a principles and contextualist position regarding ethical decision making. A principles orientation centers around the belief that there are more or less fixed, eternal moral laws or principles which can be discovered by man in nature and/or known through revelation in scripture and which are the basis for ethical decision making. The contextualist position rejects all principles or unchanging moral laws. The man who is morally responsible is the man who responds to God in each new context or situation in a manner appropriate to God's humanizing work.

All items used in constructing this measure are items reflecting a contextualist position. A low summary score on these items is inferred to represent a principles position. Items used are as follows:

> The most reliable way to judge whether a certain action is good or bad is to consider the consequences.
>
> Following completely rigid moral rules may cause more harm than good.
>
> There is no moral rule which can be applied in every situation.
>
> An ethical decision which may be right in one situation may be wrong in another situation.
>
> Our world is changing so fast that a person has to act in terms of circumstances confronting him rather than expecting absolute guidance from the past.

Image of Ministry (Chapter IX)

Image of Ministry has been defined as reflecting a continuum between expressive and instrumental poles. An expressive image of ministry connotes a diffuse, qualitative image in which emphasis is placed on the quality of the minister's life, on his distinctive mode of being in relation to God, on his representative functions. An instrumental image emphasizes the minister's specialized competence as a professional in enabling the laity in their life and mission as Christians. With reference to the laity he is a primus inter pares (first among equals) rather than one set apart from the laity as a representative Christian. Items used include both expressive statements (E) and instrumental ones (I). Expressive statements were summed and subtracted from the sum of instrumental statements to arrive at a score for each respondent. Items used are as follows:

(E) The minister conserves and interprets the heritage of the Christian tradition.

(I) The minister is called to "be where the action is," and to join with those who are working for justice and love.

(E) Through the witness of his words and life, the minister brings people to a personal knowledge of Christ and to a consciousness of His Lordship in everyday Christian living.

(I) The minister is no different from any Christian except that he has special training which equips him to coordinate the work of the church.

(I) As a Christian, one is called to make of the ministry whatever is necessary in order to communicate the Gospel to the needs of our day.

(E) In last analysis, the ministry is not so much something that one does, but rather is a calling to a particular state of life.

(E) Through faithful study of the World of God and a life of personal devotion, the minister leads people to a deeper faith in God.

(I) The minister's calling is to place himself in the service of persons, whoever they may be, to help them cope with their problems and find health and joy.

Ministerial Morale (Chapter IX)

Ministerial morale is defined, quite simply, as the minister's evaluation of the significance of his profession in modern society. Items used reflect high (H) or low (L) evaluation of the significance of the ministry as a profession. Items reflecting low evaluation were summed and subtracted from the items indicating high evaluation to give a measure of the respondent's morale. The higher the score, the higher the morale. Items used are as follows:

(H) There are disadvantages in the ministry, but it still carries a prestige and dignity which no other profession shares.

(L) The profession of clergyman is becoming an impossible burden for anyone needing a meaningful sense of vocation.

(H) The ministry is the most awesome, and at the same time the most challenging of all professions.

(L) The minister is a kind of "fifth" wheel, an employee of an institution that is comforting to have around but far removed from the real issues in the world.

(H) I can think of no more exciting work than the opportunity the ministry gives me to participate in God's history.

(L) Today's laymen and clergymen face the plain fact that there is no need for an ordained professional ministry.

Church Involvement in Society (Chapter VIII)

Unlike the preceding scales, which are summated rating or Likert scales, the scale measuring attitudes towards the involvement of the church in society is a Guttman or cumulative scale.[5] The scale, as the title implies, consists of items measuring attitudes towards the church's involvement in social issues. The items chosen were analyzed for scalibility using the method developed by Robert N. Ford.[6] The coefficient of reproducibility for the scale is .89, and the coefficient of minimal marginal reproducibility is .63. Items used from the Danforth questionnaire to form the scale are as follows:

---

[5] Ibid., 172-200; and Matilda W. Riley, J. W. Riley, Jr., Jackson Toby, et. al., Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1954).

[6] "A Rapid Scoring Procedure For Scaling Attitude Questions," Ibid., 273-305.

A. The Christian church can only be its true self as it exists for humanity.

B. The mission of the church is to bring new awareness of the possibilities of life and to prepare people to serve the world.

C. The church must speak to the great social issues of our day, or else its very existence is threatened.

D. The church should be taking a much more active role in the struggle for world peace.

Scoring of the statements involved assigning new weights to the responses to each of the statements, using Ford's rapid scoring method (see footnote 5). The original scores and weighted scores are as follows:

Statements	Original Scores	=	Weighted Scores
A	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	=	0
	6	=	8
B	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	=	0
	6	=	4
C	1, 2, 3, 4	=	0
	5, 6	=	2
D	1, 2, 3, 4	=	0
	5, 6	=	1

Once new weighted scores were assigned to each respondent, a unique score was computed for each respondent by summing the weighted scores on each of the statements. Following Ford's procedure of scoring,[7] the unique scores were grouped into five scale types and each respondent was assigned a scale score.

---

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 296 f.

Scale Types	Scale Score
Most favorable	4
Second most favorable	3
Third most favorable	2
Fourth most favorable	1
Least favorable	0

II. OTHER SCALES

The following measures, as indicated in the introductory paragraphs to Appendix C, are drawn from the scales which were developed by Hadden in his preliminary analyses of the Danforth data. Since my use of them has been limited and basically descriptive in an attempt to aid in interpretation of the primary scales, I have generally adopted the scales as Hadden constructed them rather than subjecting them to further item analysis.[8] The statements used for the various scales were combined into Likert summated rating scales as described above. Each scale is described below:

Theological Certainty (Chapter VII)

The attitude measured by the following items reflects the degree to which an individual is certain or uncertain about his basic theological affirmations. Items reflect either certainty (C) or doubt and uncertainty (U). Items used are as follows:

---

[8] See Hadden, "A Study of the Protestant Ministry," for a discussion of the methods used in constructing the scales. Most of the scales were developed through factor analysis using the Verimax criterion.

(C) Ambiguity and uncertainty as to what one is to believe and do are signs of faithlessness and indifference to God.

(U) I would expect a thinking Christian to have doubts about the existence of God.

(U) I am no longer certain of many of the doctrines I once thought were central to the Christian faith.

(U) I find it increasingly difficult to believe in God.

Social Issues (Chapter VIII)

As considered briefly in Chapter VIII, several scales measuring attitudes on specific currently important social issues were available from the Danforth data. The working definitions of each of these scales is basically straightforward and suggested by the title given to the scale.

(1) Civil Rights: These items measure positive or negative attitudes towards the struggle for civil rights by Blacks. Negative statements are designated (N), and positive statements are designated (P). Scoring for each statement has been reversed due to the preponderance of negative items in order that high scores on the scale might represent positive attitudes towards civil rights. Items used are:

(N) Negroes would be better off if they would take advantage of of the opportunities that have been made available rather than spending so much time protesting.

(N) I basically disapprove of the Negro civil rights movement in America.

(N) The racial crisis in the U. S. would probably be much less serious if the Federal government had not intervened.

(N) Negroes could solve many of their own problems if they would not be so irresponsible and carefree about life.

(P) I am in basic sympathy with northern ministers and students who have gone to the South to work for civil rights.

(2) Government Responsibility: These statements reflect attitudes pro and con regarding the responsibility and/or necessity for government involvement in a wide number of areas of society. One negative (N) and three positive (P) items have been summed.

(N) The government is providing too many services that should be left to private enterprise.

(P) I am not nearly so concerned with the amount of power of the Federal Government as I am with the irresponsibility of many government officials.

(P) Adequate medical care for the aged through some kind of governmental program is badly needed.

(P) I believe that a larger proportion of the Federal Government's budget should be allocated for public welfare expenditures such as schools, hospitals, parks, etc.

(3) Anti-Communism: Attitudes towards the threat of communism to American society and to world peace are measured by the statements in this scale. Three negative items (N) have been summed and the score on the one positive item (P) has been subtracted in order to measure the degree to which each respondent is anti-communist in orientation.

(N) Any means must, if necessary, be used to preserve America from the menace of atheistic Communism.

(N) There can never be a complete reduction in nuclear arms so long as there are Communist nations in the world.

(N) The only real victory over Communism is total victory.

(P) Red China should be admitted to the United Nations.

(4) Urban Problems: The three statements which form this measure reflect the degree of sympathy which the respondents have towards urban problems, especially those facing the central cities as compared with the suburbs. One negative (N) item was subtracted from the sum of two positive (P) items to indicate the degree of positive attitudes.

(N) Suburban people have enough community problems to meet without accepting any more economic and political burdens of the central city.

(P) The suburban churches have become a force for retreat from urban responsibilities and realities.

(P) Christian education needs to bring laymen face to face with urban problems and propose solutions.

(5) Sexual Morality: The attitudes measured in this scale reflect agreement or disagreement with traditional Christian teachings regarding pre-marital and extra-marital sexual relations. Items that are negative (N) towards traditional Christian teachings have been summed and subtracted from the sum of those positive (P) towards traditionsl teachings to give the degree of favorableness towards traditional sexual morality.

(P) College teachers and counselors are too lenient in advising students about pre-marital sex.

(P) Although popular views on sex have changed in the past quarter of a century, procreation is still the major purpose and intercourse between marital partners should be carried out with moderation.

(N) The churches should initiate inquiries into the implications of Christian convictions for the relations of the sexes, not assuming that there is any actual consensus in the churches on sexual morality.

(N) It is conceivable that a particular situation could morally justify extra-marital relations.

(N) The changes in our society affecting sexual relations are so profound that old patterns of morality are not adequate for the future.

Ministerial Roles (Chapter IX)

In Chapter Nine, scales measuring the degree of enjoyment of various more traditional and more contemporary roles in which ministers engage were introduced in order to aid in the interpretation of the image of ministry scale. These scales were available from Hadden's analysis; although, in some cases, I have changed the title given the scale out of personal preference. The items used, with the exception of two which will be mentioned below, described activities in which ministers typically and frequently engage. Respondents were asked to indicate (on a six-point scale) their degree of enjoyment or satisfaction derived from the activity, independent of the time they may devote to it. The role scales which have been selected from Hadden's analysis and the items used in their construction are as follows.

(1) Evangelist: The attitudes and role behaviors referred to here are those which reflect a concern to witness to the Gospel both by personal example and proclamation in order to save souls and lead people into a deeper Christian experience. Items used are all positive towards this role and scores have been summed for each respondent.

Maintaining a disciplined life of prayer and personal devotion.

Winning a lost soul to Christ.

Participating in evangelistic meetings.

Privately encountering God through prayer.

Reading the Holy Bible.

Teaching people to use their Bibles in personal meditations.

(2) Traditional Pastor: The activities designated in these items reflect basically traditional activities of the Christian pastor in contrast to the relatively more psychologically oriented counseling activities designated as the pastoral counselor role (see below).

Ministering to the sick, dying, and bereaved.

Visiting new residents and recruiting new members.

Visiting regularly in the homes of the congregation.

Ministering to the aged.

(3) Priest: The activities here are basically those relating to the minister's functions in leading the worship services of the church, particularly his role in the celebration of the Sacraments as contrasted with preaching.

Leading public worship.

Administering Communion.

Conducting a baptismal service.

(4) Preacher: Like the priestly role defined above, the preacher role is related to the public worship of the church; however,

these items refer to preaching as distinct from the celebration of the Sacraments.

Leading public worship.

Preaching sermons.

Preparing sermons.

(5) Community Leader: Activities reflected in this scale concern involvement by the minister in activities in the community relating to social justice, community welfare, and influencing community policy-making.

Organizing and helping groups who are victims of social neglect or injustice.

Influencing the policies of major organizations or institutions in my community.

Spotting the key places in the community where decisions influencing our common life are being made and informing church members of this.

Participating in creating plans for improvement of city life.

(6) Administrator: These activities have to do with the organizational activities of the minister in relation to the internal functioning of the local congregation.

Working with congregational boards and committees.

Managing the church office -- records, correspondence, information center, etc.

Promoting and creating enthusiasm for church activities.

Helping manage church finances.

(7) Pastoral Counselor: As previously indicated in the

definition of the Traditional Pastor role, activities reflecting the Pastoral Counselor are those which imply somewhat more psychologically oriented counseling of individuals regarding a variety of personal problems.

> Counseling with people facing the major decisions of life, e.g., marriage, vocation.
>
> Counseling with people about their moral and personal problems.
>
> Helping a person or family resolve a serious problem, whether it be spiritual, social, psychological, or economic.

(8) Teacher of the Congregation: Items used in constructing this scale refer generally to the role of the minister in teaching his congregation; that is, enabling them to understand the theological heritage of the church and to relate it to issues facing them in contemporary society. The first two items, like those discussed above, ask for the minister's degree of enjoyment of the activities. The third and fourth items ask how desirous the minister is in engaging in the activities. Both require responses on a six-point scale.

> Helping people come to grips with the problems involved in the relationship between the Christian heritage and the modern scientific world.
>
> Discussing contemporary theological issues and viewpoints with educated persons.
>
> Be a theologian of the congregation, helping laymen to think theologically.
>
> Engage the adults of my congregation in a search for the concrete meaning of their Christian commitment for responsibilities in various aspects of their work and leisure.

III. QUALITY INDEX

The index of institutional quality, first introduced in Chapter Six, was constructed, following the example of Lazarsfeld and Theilens,[9] by assigning weights to each seminary on several items for which quantifiable data were available. The weights were then summed to arrive at an overall score for each seminary. The items used and the weights assigned are as follows:

1. Faculty-Student Ratio

   14 - 16 = 1
   11 - 13 = 2
   10 = 3
   8 - 9 = 4
   5 - 7 = 5

2. Size of Library (Books)

   Under 75,000 = 1
   75,000 - 100,000 = 2
   100,001 - 150,000 = 3
   150,001 - 200,000 = 4
   Over 200,000 = 5

3. Books Per Student

   Under 300 = 1
   300 - 500 = 2
   501 - 600 = 3
   601 - 900 = 4
   Over 900 = 5

---

[9] *The Academic Mind*, *op. cit.*, pp. 411-414.

4. Proportion Doctorates on Faculty

.30 - .45 = 1
.46 - .59 = 2
.60 - .69 = 3
.70 - .79 = 4
.80 or above = 5

5. Number of Periodicals in Library

Under 300 = 1
300 - 399 = 2
400 - 499 = 3
500 - 599 = 4
Over 600 = 5

6. Periodicals Per Student

.5 - 1 = 1
1.1 - 1.7 = 2
1.8 - 2.3 = 3
2.4 - 2.9 = 4
3 or over = 5

When the weights were summed and each school was assigned a score, the index had a range of seven to twenty-seven. This range was collapsed into three categories:

7 - 14 = Low Quality
15 - 22 = Medium
23 - 27 = High

These cutting points were chosen primarily because the seminaries tended to cluster into three groups; i.e., there were three distinct clusters according to scores, with gaps of several digits between the clusters.

APPENDIX D

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Below are several tables which were referred to, but not included, at various points in the text. Each is one of the structural effects tables into which a control variable has been introduced.

TABLE 51

THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY, CONTROLLING FOR PREFERENCE FOR SEMINARY

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Theological	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Seminary Was First Choice					
Conservative	46.1	37.1	41.6	11.3	6.0	7.2
Mod. Conservative	31.1	33.6	32.4	24.0	19.6	20.6
Mod. Liberal	15.1	16.8	16.0	36.7	29.9	31.5
Liberal	7.5	12.5	10.1	28.0	44.5	40.6
Total	49.7	50.3	100.0	23.6	76.4	100.0
(N) =	(371)	(375)	(746)	(150)	(485)	(635)
	(2) Seminary Was Second Choice					
Conservative	20.6	11.5	15.1	17.4	8.5	10.5
Mod. Conservative	29.4	21.2	24.4	26.1	19.5	21.0
Mod. Liberal	26.5	25.0	25.6	26.1	24.4	24.8
Liberal	23.5	42.3	34.9	30.4	47.6	43.8
Total	39.5	60.5	100.0	21.9	78.1	100.0
(N) =	(34)	(52)	(86)	(23)	(82)	(105)

TABLE 51 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Theological	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Seminary Was First Choice					
Conservative	10.5	7.9	8.8	38.7	26.8	29.1
Mod. Conservative	37.2	23.6	28.8	29.3	26.0	26.7
Mod. Liberal	25.6	33.6	30.5	20.4	21.9	21.6
Liberal	26.7	35.0	31.9	11.6	25.3	22.6
Total	38.1	61.9	100.0	19.5	80.5	100.0
(N) =	(86)	(140)	(226)	(225)	(930)	(1155)
	(2) Seminary Was Second Choice					
Conservative	11.1	14.7	13.5	24.0	9.6	12.2
Mod. Conservative	38.9	32.4	34.6	24.0	16.7	18.0
Mod. Liberal	27.8	17.6	21.2	24.0	27.2	26.6
Liberal	22.2	35.3	30.8	28.0	46.5	43.2
Total	34.6	65.4	100.0	18.0	82.0	100.0
(N) +	(18)	(34)	(52)	((25)	(114)	(139)

TABLE 51 (continued)

Theological Orientation	SEMINARY TYPE Religious Community Personal Philosophy TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	Other TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
(1) Seminary Was First Choice						
Conservative	0.6	5.4	3.5	18.9	36.3	34.1
Mod. Conservative	9.7	21.3	16.5	33.9	30.5	30.9
Mod. Liberal	30.3	35.3	33.2	20.5	19.1	19.3
Liberal	59.4	38.0	46.8	26.8	14.0	15.6
Total	42.1	58.8	100.0	12.6	87.4	100.0
(N) =	(155)	(221)	(376)	(127)	(878)	(1005)
(2) Seminary Was Second Choice						
Conservative	5.0	3.7	4.3	3.7	17.9	15.3
Mod. Conservative	5.0	3.7	4.3	22.2	29.9	28.5
Mod. Liberal	15.0	44.4	31.9	22.2	23.1	22.9
Liberal	75.0	48.1	59.6	51.9	29.1	33.3
Total	42.6	57.4	100.0	18.7	81.2	100.0
(N) =	(20)	(27)	(47)	(27)	(117)	(144)

TABLE 52

THEOLOGICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY, CONTROLLING FOR SEMINARY RANK ON QUALITY INDEX

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Theological	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) High on Quality Index			
Conservative	-	-	-	5.6	1.3	2.3
Mod. Conservative	-	-	-	22.5	11.0	13.7
Mod. Liberal	-	-	-	26.8	16.5	18.9
Liberal	-	-	-	45.1	71.2	65.1
Total	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	-	-	-	(71)	(236)	(307)
			(2) Medium on Quality Index			
Conservative	16.8	8.0	11.9	20.5	5.7	8.9
Mod. Conservative	30.2	25.5	27.6	28.2	13.6	16.8
Mod. Liberal	20.1	24.5	22.5	15.4	18.6	17.9
Liberal	32.9	42.0	38.0	35.9	62.1	56.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(149)	(188)	(337)	(39)	(140)	(179)
			(3) Low on Quality Index			
Conservative	59.5	53.9	56.8	13.9	13.8	13.8
Mod. Conservative	28.0	33.7	30.8	21.5	27.6	26.0
Mod. Liberal	7.8	6.6	7.2	21.5	21.4	21.5
Liberal	4.7	5.8	5.2	43.1	37.2	38.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(257)	(243)	(500)	(65)	(196)	(261)

TABLE 52 (continued)

Theological Orientation	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) High on Quality Index					
Conservative	6.3	7.7	7.3	4.4	0.9	1.2
Mod. Conservative	25.0	20.5	21.8	17.4	11.4	11.9
Mod. Liberal	31.2	15.4	20.0	21.7	18.3	18.7
Liberal	37.5	56.4	50.9	56.5	69.4	68.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(16)	(39)	(55)	(23)	(229)	(252)
	(2) Medium on Quality Index					
Conservative	12.5	10.5	11.4	15.8	9.6	10.8
Mod. Conservative	31.3	42.1	37.1	28.4	21.5	22.9
Mod. Liberal	31.2	10.5	20.0	24.2	20.2	21.0
Liberal	25.0	36.8	31.4	31.6	48.7	45.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(16)	(19)	(35)	(95)	(386)	(41)
	(3) Low on Quality Index					
Conservative	12.0	10.1	10.8	58.7	50.9	52.7
Mod. Conservative	36.0	23.5	28.4	27.8	30.0	29.5
Mod. Liberal	18.7	21.9	20.6	6.0	10.1	9.2
Liberal	33.3	44.5	40.2	7.5	9.0	8.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(75)	(119)	(194)	(133)	(434)	(567)

TABLE 52 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
Theological Orientation	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
(1) High on Quality Index						
Conservative	-	2.1	1.2	-	8.7	7.3
Mod. Conservative	7.3	15.5	11.9	22.2	21.8	21.8
Mod. Liberal	14.5	21.8	18.7	11.1	21.7	20.0
Liberal	78.2	60.6	68.2	66.7	47.8	50.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(110)	(142)	(242)	(9)	(46)	(55)
(2) Medium on Quality Index						
Conservative	4.2	12.0	8.9	1.7	13.2	11.4
Mod. Conservative	10.4	16.0	13.8	23.7	27.5	27.0
Mod. Liberal	14.6	21.3	18.7	18.6	22.2	21.6
Liberal	70.8	40.7	58.6	56.0	37.1	40.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =				(59)	(334)	(393)
(3) Low on Quality Index						
Conservative	-	3.1	2.0	28.4	47.1	44.8
Mod. Conservative	-	28.1	18.4	33.0	29.5	29.9
Mod. Liberal	47.1	25.0	32.7	15.9	9.9	10.7
Liberal	52.9	43.8	46.9	22.7	13.5	14.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(17)	(32)	(49)	(88)	(624)	(712)

TABLE 53

ETHICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY CONTROLLING FOR FATHER'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) Low SES			
Principals	65.4	57.0	61.0	46.9	36.1	38.8
Contextual	34.6	43.0	39.0	53.1	63.9	61.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(136)	(149)	(285)	(32)	(97)	(129)
			(2) Moderately Low SES			
Principals	57.3	44.4	50.8	52.7	42.9	45.5
Contextual	42.7	55.6	49.2	47.3	57.1	54.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(89)	(90)	(179)	(55)	(147)	(202)
			(3) Moderately High SES			
Principals	61.3	63.9	62.6	35.0	35.0	35.0
Contextual	38.7	36.1	37.4	65.0	65.0	65.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(106)	(108)	(214)	(40)	(140)	(180)
			(4) High SES			
Principals	48.0	44.0	45.9	25.0	28.2	27.5
Contextual	52.0	56.0	54.1	75.0	71.8	72.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(75)	(84)	(159)	(48)	(188)	(236)

TABLE 53 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Vocational School			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Low SES					
Principals	57.9	53.3	55.1	59.3	52.5	54.0
Contextual	42.1	46.7	44.9	40.7	47.5	56.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(19)	(30)	(49)	(81)	(284)	(365)
	(2) Moderately Low SES					
Principals	55.6	60.4	58.8	54.1	42.9	45.2
Contextual	44.4	39.6	41.2	45.9	57.1	54.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(27)	(53)	(80)	(61)	(240)	(301)
	(3) Moderately High SES					
Principals	54.5	35.9	44.4	66.1	48.1	51.2
Contextual	45.5	64.1	55.6	33.9	51.9	48.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(33)	(39)	(72)	(56)	(266)	(322)
	(4) High SES					
Principals	32.1	36.4	34.9	49.1	32.1	34.9
Contextual	67.9	63.6	65.1	50.9	67.9	65.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(28)	(55)	(83)	(53)	(259)	(312)

TABLE 53 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Graduate School			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) Low SES			
Principals	9.1	37.1	23.5	51.5	61.0	60.1
Contextual	90.9	62.9	76.5	48.5	39.0	39.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(33)	(35)	(68)	(33)	(313)	(346)
			(2) Moderately Low SES			
Principals	25.6	37.3	32.7	37.1	56.8	54.2
Contextual	74.4	62.7	67.3	62.9	43.2	45.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(43)	(67)	(110)	(35)	(236)	(271)
			(3) Moderately High SES			
Principals	18.4	31.7	26.5	42.5	60.6	57.8
Contextual	81.6	68.3	73.5	57.5	39.4	42.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(38)	(60)	(98)	(47)	(249)	(296)
			(4) High SES			
Principals	21.3	26.4	24.3	36.6	42.2	41.3
Contextual	78.7	73.6	75.7	63.4	57.8	58.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(61)	(87)	(148)	(41)	(206)	(247)

TABLE 54

ETHICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY, CONTROLLING FOR PREFERENCE FOR SEMINARY

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
Ethical Orientation	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Seminary Was First Choice					
Principals	60.2	56.2	58.2	37.1	34.8	35.4
Contextual	39.8	43.8	41.8	62.9	65.2	64.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(372)	(381)	(753)	(151)	(488)	(639)
	(2) Seminary Was Second Choice					
Principals	50.0	34.0	40.5	58.3	35.7	40.7
Contextual	50.0	66.0	59.5	41.7	64.3	59.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(34)	(50)	(84)	(24)	(84)	(108)

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Seminary Was First Choice					
Principals	49.4	44.4	46.3	58.3	45.5	48.0
Contextual	50.6	55.6	53.7	41.7	54.5	52.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(87)	(142)	(229)	(228)	(935)	(1163)

TABLE 54 (continued)

Ethical Orientation	SEMINARY TYPE Vocational School Personal Philosophy PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	Other PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
(2) Seminary Was Second Choice						
Principals	50.0	54.3	52.7	47.8	33.3	35.8
Contextual	50.0	45.7	47.3	52.2	66.7	64.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(20)	(35)	(55)	(23)	(114)	(137)

	Graduate School Personal Philosophy TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	Other TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
(1) Seminary Was First Choice						
Principals	20.0	32.4	27.3	45.0	56.8	55.3
Contextual	80.0	67.6	72.7	55.0	43.2	44.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(155)	(222)	(377)	(129)	(886)	(1015)
(2) Seminary Was Second Choice						
Principals	15.0	29.6	23.4	25.9	50.8	46.2
Contextual	85.0	70.4	76.6	74.1	49.2	53.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(20)	(27)	(47)	(27)	(118)	(145)

TABLE 55

ETHICAL ORIENTATION BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY, CONTROLLING FOR DENOMINATION

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) Methodist			
Principals	52.5	35.8	41.4	50.7	48.1	48.7
Contextual	47.5	64.2	58.6	49.3	51.9	51.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(61)	(120)	(181)	(73)	(239)	(312)
			(2) Presbyterian			
Principals	47.4	27.3	36.6	39.6	20.9	25.0
Contextual	52.6	72.7	63.4	60.4	79.1	75.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(38)	(44)	(82)	(53)	(191)	(244)
			(3) Baptist			
Principals	56.0	82.4	66.7	22.2	30.2	28.9
Contextual	44.0	17.6	33.3	77.8	69.8	71.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(25)	(17)	(42)	(9)	(43)	(52)
			(4) Missouri Synod Lutheran			
Principals	70.6	82.3	75.5	-	-	-
Contextual	29.4	17.7	24.5	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-	-
(N) =	(85)	(62)	(147)	-	-	-

TABLE 55 (continued)

Ethical Orientation	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(5) Episcopal			
Principals	45.7	55.6	49.1	25.0	32.3	30.2
Contextual	54.3	44.4	50.9	75.0	67.7	69.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(35)	(18)	(53)	(40)	(99)	(139)
			(6) American Lutheran			
Principals	62.4	59.4	60.8	-	-	-
Contextual	37.7	40.6	39.2	-	-	-
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	-	-	-
(N) =	(162)	(170)	(332)	-	-	-

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) Methodist			
Principals	62.3	55.1	57.7	47.4	38.4	40.0
Contextual	37.7	44.9	42.3	52.6	61.6	60.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(61)	(107)	(168)	(57)	(268)	(325)
			(2) Presbyterian			
Principals	28.6	44.4	37.5	34.0	25.4	26.9
Contextual	71.4	55.6	62.5	66.0	74.6	73.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(14)	(18)	(32)	(50)	(244)	(294)

TABLE 55 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Vocational School			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
			(3) Baptist			
Principals	50.0	100.0	75.0	66.7	38.9	44.4
Contextual	50.0	-	25.0	33.3	61.1	55.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(2)	(2)	(4)	(18)	(72)	(90)
			(4) Missouri Synod Lutheran			
Principals	-	-	-	86.2	72.9	75.5
Contextual	-	-	-	13.8	27.1	24.5
Total	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	-	-	-	(29)	(118)	(147)
			(5) Episcopal			
Principals	33.3	26.0	28.8	61.1	36.2	40.2
Contextual	66.7	74.0	71.2	38.9	63.8	59.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(30)	(50)	(80)	(18)	(94)	(112)
			(6) American Lutheran			
Principals	-	-	-	65.8	59.3	60.8
Contextual	-	-	-	34.2	40.7	39.2
Total	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	-	-	-	(79)	(253)	(332)

TABLE 55 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Graduate School			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
			(1) Methodist			
Principals	21.7	35.0	30.2	38.8	54.3	51.5
Contextual	78.3	65.0	69.8	61.2	45.7	48.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(46)	(80)	(126)	(67)	(300)	(367)
			(2) Presbyterian			
Principals	15.4	29.4	23.3	16.7	38.5	36.2
Contextual	84.6	70.6	76.7	83.3	61.5	63.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(91)	(119)	(210)	(12)	(104)	(116)
			(3) Baptist			
Principals	33.3	20.0	26.7	40.0	55.9	54.7
Contextual	66.7	80.0	73.3	60.0	44.1	45.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(15)	(15)	(30)	(5)	(59)	(64)
			(4) Missouri Synod Lutheran			
Principals	-	-	-	81.8	75.0	75.5
Contextual	-	-	-	18.2	25.0	24.5
Total	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	-	-	-	(11)	(136)	(147)

TABLE 55 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Graduate School			Other		
Ethical	Personal Philosophy					
Orientation	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
			(5) Episcopal			
Principals	21.7	40.0	32.8	38.9	36.2	36.6
Contextual	78.3	60.0	67.2	61.1	63.8	63.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	(23)	(35)	(58)	(18)	(116)	(134)
			(6) American Lutheran			
Principals	-	-	-	44.2	63.3	60.8
Contextual	-	-	-	55.8	36.7	39.2
Total	-	-	-	100.0	100.0	100.0
(N) =	-	-	-	(43)	(289)	(332)

TABLE 56

IMAGE OF MINISTRY BY SEMINARY TYPE AND PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY, CONTROLLING FOR PREFERENCE FOR SEMINARY

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
Image of Ministry	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Peers Tradition/Spiritual					
Expressive	51.0	35.9	49.2	34.7	27.5	32.2
Mod. Expressive	23.4	33.3	24.6	31.6	37.3	33.6
Mod. Instrumental	14.1	10.3	13.7	11.6	17.6	13.7
Instrumental	11.4	20.5	12.5	22.1	17.6	20.5
Total	88.1	11.9	100.0	65.1	34.9	100.0
(N) =	(290)	(39)	(329)	(95)	(51)	(146)
	(2) Peers Practical/Spiritual					
Expressive	49.1	44.4	45.6	30.0	30.7	30.6
Mod. Expressive	32.7	27.8	29.1	35.0	35.1	35.1
Mod. Instrumental	10.9	15.2	14.1	5.0	13.2	11.9
Instrumental	7.3	12.6	11.2	30.0	21.1	22.4
Total	26.7	73.3	100.2	14.9	85.1	100.0
(N) =	(55)	(151)	(206)	(20)	(114)	(134)
	(3) Peers Tradition/Secular					
Expressive	44.8	25.0	29.2	31.6	16.2	18.5
Mod. Expressive	34.5	31.5	32.1	23.7	22.9	23.0
Mod. Instrumental	3.4	17.6	14.6	18.4	16.2	16.5
Instrumental	17.2	25.9	24.1	26.3	44.8	41.9
Total	21.2	78.8	100.0	15.3	84.7	100.0
(N) =	(29)	(108)	(137)	(38)	(210)	(248)

TABLE 56 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Religious Community			Other		
Image of	Personal Philosophy					
Ministry	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(4) Peers Practical/Secular					
Expressive	61.5	15.6	23.4	-	24.5	22.9
Mod. Expressive	15.4	32.8	29.9	28.6	22.5	22.9
Mod. Instrumental	7.7	21.9	19.5	42.9	19.6	21.1
Instrumental	15.4	29.7	27.3	28.6	33.3	33.0
Total	16.9	83.1	100.0	6.4	93.6	100.0
(N) =	(13)	(64)	(77)	(7)	(102)	(109)

	Vocational School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Peers Tradition/Spiritual					
Expressive	32.1	42.0	39.4	45.7	44.7	44.7
Mod. Expressive	62.5	30.0	37.9	28.6	25.4	25.7
Mod. Instrumental	-	16.0	12.1	14.3	13.9	13.9
Instrumental	6.2	12.0	10.6	11.4	16.0	15.6
Total	24.2	75.8	100.0	8.6	91.4	100.0
(N) =	(16)	(50)	(66)	(35)	(374)	(409)
	(2) Peers Practical/Spiritual					
Expressive	29.2	15.4	26.9	47.1	36.4	43.5
Mod. Expressive	41.5	46.2	42.3	25.9	33.0	28.2
Mod. Instrumental	15.4	-	12.8	12.6	14.8	13.4
Instrumental	13.8	38.5	17.9	14.4	15.9	14.9
Total	83.3	16.7	100.0	66.4	33.6	100.0
(N) =	(65)	(13)	(78)	(174)	(88)	(262)

TABLE 56 (continued)

	SEMINARY TYPE					
	Vocational School			Other		
Image of	Personal Philosophy					
Ministry	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL	PR/SPR	OTHER	TOTAL
	(3) Peers Tradition/Secular					
Expressive	-	24.3	20.9	33.3	22.0	22.5
Mod. Expressive	66.7	21.6	27.9	33.3	25.7	26.0
Mod. Instrumental	16.7	29.7	27.9	20.0	14.1	14.3
Instrumental	16.7	24.3	23.3	13.3	38.2	37.1
Total	14.0	86.0	100.0	4.4	95.6	100.0
(N) =	(6)	(37)	(43)	(15)	(327)	(342)
	(4) Peers Practical/Secular					
Expressive	60.0	36.6	41.2	17.4	16.1	16.3
Mod. Expressive	10.0	19.5	17.6	26.1	29.5	28.9
Mod. Instrumental	-	19.5	15.7	13.0	24.1	22.2
Instrumental	30.0	24.4	25.5	43.5	30.4	32.6
Total	19.6	80.4	100.0	17.0	83.0	100.0
(N) =	(10)	(41)	(51)	(23)	(112)	(135)

	Graduate School			Other		
	Personal Philosophy					
	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
	(1) Peers Tradition/Spiritual					
Expressive	7.7	29.5	25.7	21.4	48.3	47.4
Mod. Expressive	23.1	29.5	28.4	35.7	26.9	27.2
Mod. Instrumental	38.5	11.5	16.2	-	13.7	13.2
Instrumental	30.8	29.5	29.7	42.9	11.1	12.2
Total	17.6	82.4	100.0	3.5	96.5	100.0
(N) =	(13)	(61)	(74)	(14)	(387)	(401)

TABLE 56 (continued)

Image of Ministry	SEMINARY TYPE Graduate School Personal Philosophy TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL	Other TR/SEC	OTHER	TOTAL
			(2) Peers Practical/Spiritual			
Expressive	100.0	32.6	31.1	-	42.0	41.0
Mod. Expressive	-	27.9	26.7	57.1	31.6	32.2
Mod. Instrumental	-	11.6	11.1	42.9	12.8	13.6
Instrumental	-	27.9	31.1	-	13.5	13.2
Total	4.4	95.6	100.0	2.4	97.6	100.0
(N) =	(2)	(43)	(45)	(7)	(288)	(295)
			(3) Peers Tradition/Secular			
Expressive	14.7	21.1	16.6	28.4	27.7	28.1
Mod. Expressive	19.1	26.3	21.2	28.4	34.9	31.2
Mod. Instrumental	16.9	10.5	15.0	15.6	18.1	16.7
Instrumental	49.3	42.1	47.2	27.5	19.3	24.0
Total	70.5	29.5	100.0	56.8	43.2	100.0
(N) =	(136)	(57)	(193)	(109)	(83)	(192)
			(4) Peers Practical/Secular			
Expressive	7.7	7.1	7.3	21.1	31.2	29.8
Mod. Expressive	15.4	33.3	29.1	31.6	23.2	24.4
Mod. Instrumental	23.1	26.2	25.5	26.3	17.0	18.3
Instrumental	53.8	33.3	38.2	21.1	28.6	27.5
Total	23.6	[illegible]	100.0	14.5	85.5	100.0
(N) =	[illegible]	[illegible]	(55)	(19)	(112)	(131)